UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2587th MEETING: 12 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2587)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2587th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 12 June 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2587)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);

(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);

(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2586th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Davane (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mrs. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding

(South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Haiti, Japan, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Al-Mosfir (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Libyan Socialist Arab Jamahiriya, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that your wisdom and experience will lead the Council to the best possible outcome. I should like also to express my delegation's appreciation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for the excellent manner in which they conducted the work of the Council last month.

8. The Council is meeting to resume its deliberations on the question of Namibia at a time when the gravity of the situation in southern Africa is increasing and jeopardizing international peace and security. The schemes and conspiracies of the racist Pretoria régime against the Namibian people are continuing with the aim of frustrating the legitimate and heroic struggle of that people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and legitimate representative.

9. The racist régime is making a desperate attempt to prolong its illegal occupation of the Territory. This is the persistent attitude of the racist régime, which defied the will of the international community and flouts the resolutions of international organizations calling for an end to that occupation, particularly General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and the resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 264 (1969), which calls for the immediate withdrawal of Pretoria's forces from Namibia, resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and resolutions 385 (1976), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983). At the same time, the racist régime is escalating its threats and acts of aggression as well as its immoral economic measures against the front-line States with a view to exercising pressure on those States and influencing their anti-*apartheid* position.

10. The resolutions of the United Nations and other international organizations calling for a boycott of the Government of South Africa are totally defied by some parties. This defiance has reached the extent of aiding and supporting the South African Government economically and militarily. This has been demonstrated in continuous rejections of any measures that the Council attempted to take against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to force it to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and to withdraw its forces from Namibia. This position, which is contrary to the international will as expressed by the Members of the United Nations, has been further demonstrated by the abuse by some Western States of the veto power with regard to the draft resolutions on Namibia brought before the Council in past years.

11. The defiance of the resolutions of international organizations reached its peak when the racist-Zionist entity in occupied Palestine and its racist counterpart in South Africa, with the assistance of some Western Governments, established a close collaboration that covered all economic, military and technical fields, including co-operation in the production of nuclear weapons. This has encouraged the South African Government to persist in its defiance of the international will, enabling it to continue to pursue an aggressive policy against the front-line States.

12. The majority of the peoples of the world have discovered long ago the expansionist and racist nature of the Pretoria régime, its inhuman alliances and its links with world imperialism and zionism, as a bastion for the preservation of the colonialist strategic and economic interests in southern Africa. This alliance of colonialism and racism has enabled the Pretoria régime to continue its defiance and scorn of the international will. It is the main reason why the Namibian people have so far been prevented from achieving their freedom and independence. This alliance has opposed the forces of liberation and progress in Africa and the Third World in their attempt to abolish all forms of colonialist domination and racial discrimination. The alliance has sought, in defiance of the international will, to impose sham settlements with a view to bringing about a *fait accompli*. An example of this is the recent attempt by the racist régime to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia. There have also been other manoeuvres that preceded this attempt to establish false constitutional structures in Namibia, such as the so-called state council and national conference. It was a desperate attempt by that régime to circumvent the legitimate national demands of the Namibian people and to bypass SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

13. The attempt by that régime to link the withdrawal of its forces from Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola is only another in the series of conspiracies in a continuing effort to obstruct the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It has been con-

demned by the international community as an element extraneous to the question and the provisions of Council resolution 435 (1978), an attempt to divert the attention of the people of the world from the essential question, namely, the illegal occupation of the Territory by the forces of South Africa. It was a pernicious bid to find a pretext for continuing this occupation, and, at the same time, it is considered as blatant interference in the internal affairs of Angola, an independent country, which requested, under Article 51 of the Charter, the assistance of Cuban troops in deterring repeated acts of aggression and military incursions into its territory by South African troops.

14. Nineteen years after the adoption by the General Assembly, in 1966, of resolution 2145 (XXI), which called for the ending of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, 16 years after the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 264 (1969), which called for the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia and the ending of South African administration of the Territory, and at a time when numerous plots, oppression, suppression, persecution and assassinations are being perpetrated by the Government of South Africa against the Namibian people, the situation in Namibia now leads us to reaffirm the need to redouble international efforts at all levels for the achievement of the legitimate demands of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, and to support the liberation struggle being waged by SWAPO against the South African Government, so that South Africa will withdraw its forces unconditionally from Namibia. This would ensure the total independence of the Namibian people and its sovereignty over all its territory, including Walvis Bay and all the Namibian offshore islands.

15. The prestige of the United Nations and the credibility of the resolutions adopted by its organs, particularly the General Assembly and the Security Council, are in jeopardy because of the deadlock on the question of Namibia ever since the adoption by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960 of resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

16. We believe that the Council bears responsibility for restoring the credibility of the United Nations by establishing that it is an effective instrument for the achievement of international peace and security through the immediate and complete implementation of General Assembly resolutions, and particularly resolution 39/15, entitled "Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa", adopted on 23 November 1984, and 39/72, entitled "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa", adopted on 13 December 1984.

17. We also believe that, at the very least, all parties should apply strictly a comprehensive system of sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter and that that régime should be expelled completely and finally from the United Nations and all other international bodies and forums so as to force it to comply with the international will and to reinforce the authority of the United Nations.

18. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the Jamahiriya's support for the Namibian people in its liberation struggle under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, for the achievement of its independence and the exercise of permanent sovereignty over its territory. I should like also to reaffirm our solidarity with the front-line States against the repeated threats and acts of aggression by the racist Pretoria régime.

19. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya regards itself as one of the front-line States against the racist régime of Pretoria. It therefore contributes, and will continue to contribute, in every way to supporting the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa, believing that the cause of freedom is an integral whole and that the racist régime of South Africa is a natural ally of its twin, the Zionist racist régime in occupied Palestine, and that eliminating the one will accelerate the elimination of the other.

20. In compliance with all the relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by international bodies and forums, my country has supported all international efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We shall continue to support the efforts of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia, since we appreciate the important role they play in the endeavour to speed up the attainment of independence by the Namibian people and to end the colonialist, racist domination over them.

21. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to offer you the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. I thank you and the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in the debate. I wish you every success in discharging your responsible duties as President.

23. I should also like to thank your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, for the able manner in which they guided the Council's work last month.

24. In the light of recent developments in Namibia, including the decision taken by Pretoria to impose a so-called internal settlement in Namibia, Mongolia was in favour of the convening of these meetings of the Council, as called for by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries and the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

25. I wish to recall my letter of 10 June 1985 to the Secretary-General [*S/17253*], in which, upon instructions from my Government, I had the honour to state the position of Mongolia, expressing its indignation and grave concern over the decision taken by the South African

régime to install a so-called interim government in Namibia. Mongolia views that decision as an attempt by the South African régime to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed by resolution 435 (1978). The Mongolian Government resolutely condemns and rejects any attempt by South Africa to impose a so-called internal settlement in Namibia and considers such action null and void, in accordance with Council resolution 439 (1978).

26. South Africa's occupation of Namibia has repeatedly been declared illegal by the United Nations. In defiance of the will of the international community, Pretoria, encouraged by the support of its Western allies and collaborators, especially the United States, persists in that occupation. The people of Namibia are being subjected by the régime to brutal repression, cold-blooded murder, arbitrary arrests and detention. Western transnational corporations and South Africa continue ruthlessly to plunder and exploit the natural resources of the Territory, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions. In order to reinforce its illegal occupation and colonial domination of the Territory, Pretoria is engaged intensively in a massive militarization of Namibia.

27. Moreover, Namibian territory is being continuously used by the racist régime for the commission of acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring sovereign and independent African States. That poses a serious threat to international peace and security. In this context, mention should be made of the most recent aggressive military actions carried out against Angola by the special forces of the South African army from Namibian territory, actions which were resolutely condemned by my country.

28. Mongolia categorically rejects any delaying tactics and the policy pursued by the Pretoria régime and the United States of linking Namibian independence to extraneous and irrelevant issues, including the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In fact, the linkage concept has been unequivocally condemned and totally rejected by the majority of States. Here I should like to refer to the Final Document adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, in which the Bureau stated that it

> "considers such linkage as repugnant to the United Nations plan and a blatant interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola and designed to subvert its sovereign rights as an independent State" [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex, para. 25*].

29. The policy of the present United States Administration of so-called constructive engagement with Pretoria is rightly viewed by the majority of Member States as an attempt to block the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on the granting of genuine independence to Namibia, and as such has been condemned by them.

30. In view of the South African racist régime's continued sabotage of United Nations efforts to bring independence to Namibia and its arrogant defiance of the will of the international community in persisting in its illegal occupation of the Territory, Mongolia fully supports the call of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries and the OAU for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

31. Mongolia is of the view that the United Nations has primary responsibility for Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and that it is therefore incumbent upon the Organization to ensure the speedy attainment by the people of Namibia of genuine independence. It is most appropriate for the United Nations, in this the very year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, to take concrete action for the granting of independence to Namibia. We should also bear in mind the fact that this year marks the fortieth year of the United Nations efforts to bring independence to the Territory.

32. We commend the valuable efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence, aimed at protecting and promoting the interests of the Namibian people, and first and foremost their right to self-determination and independence. Mongolia wholeheartedly welcomes the Declaration contained in the Final Document adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia a few days ago, at its extraordinary plenary meetings held at Vienna [*see S/17262, annex*].

33. Mongolia also expresses its full support for the decisions on Namibia taken at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi last April.

34. Mongolia reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity in their own territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. It considers that the Namibian people have a legitimate right to struggle for their freedom by all means, including armed struggle.

35. Mongolia reiterates its full solidarity with and support for the just struggle of the Namibian people led by SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, against colonial domination and for national independence.

36. In connection with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of SWAPO, we wish to extend to the people of Namibia and to the members of SWAPO and its leader, Comrade Sam Nujoma, our sincere congratulations and best wishes in their heroic struggle.

37. In conclusion, my delegation would like to urge the Council to respond to the need to achieve independence for Namibia.

38. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

39. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, it is a particular pleasure for my delegation to see you guiding the work of the Council. Mexico greatly appreciates Trinidad and Tobago's contribution to the quest of peace and the independence of peoples, both in the hemisphere and worldwide. We are confident that under your leadership this body will adopt concrete measures commensurate with the magnitude of the challenge that South Africa has placed before it.

40. May I also commend the skilful and expeditious work done by your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, during whose term of office decisions of particular significance for the developing countries were reached.

41. The Council is obliged to meet once again because of the critical situation in southern Africa. This series of meetings none the less has special characteristics since they involve the convergence of two growing but opposing processes: on the one hand, an increasing number of political decisions by Pretoria that demonstrate its rejection of the decisions of the United Nations; on the other, the mounting indignation of world public opinion and its clear effect on Governments, including those that have thus far protected or abetted South Africa.

42. The Council must reach a decision. This is not the time for a mere verbal exercise, nor for compensatory gestures that barely conceal the real impotence of this body. Nor is this the time to relate a lamentable past with which we are all familiar. The time has come to reflect, through the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the resolve of the States Members to exert real pressure on the South African régime and to compel it to comply with international law.

43. The fact are irrefutable. In recent years, South Africa has been receiving contradictory signals from the international community. On the one hand, the United Nations adopts decisive resolutions concerning the independence of Namibia and the ending of *apartheid*, bodies are established and publicity campaigns mounted, and there is an interminable series of condemnations and warnings. On the other hand, there has been strategic, economic and military collusion, a search for so-called negotiated solutions that have only led to new excuses and further delays and to the strengthening of South Africa's real power and its regional links, as well as of its influence in the West.

44. We are often subjected to campaigns designed to discredit the United Nations, campaigns in which we are accused of political ineffectiveness, but we are incapable of replying that that paralysis within the Organization derives from a system of alliances between the very countries or regions that judge us with the greatest severity.

45. Clearly, our own internal contradictions have served to encourage Pretoria's intransigence, not to curb it. It is essential that an end be put to such double-talk and that each Member State assume its own national and world responsibilities. Only in that way can we isolate the South African régime, achieve the true independence of Namibia and put an end to *apartheid*.

46. On 27 April 1981, some States members of the Council proposed a group of draft resolutions on the question of Namibia [*S/14459 to S/14463*] that included economic and political sanctions, as well as an arms and oil embargo, against South Africa. In introducing those draft resolutions, my delegation pointed out that the Geneva meeting had clearly established the limit beyond which any new offer or concession to the occupying Power would be—as it indeed turned out—ineffective and a mockery of the international community. We affirmed that it was necessary to show, by means of strong decisions, that the patience of the front-line States was not indicative of weakness and that the tasks entrusted to the Western Powers implied no sort of complicity. Three days later, at a meeting that left a profound mark on the world's conscience, those draft resolutions were vetoed. At the end of that meeting, the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO stated:

> "Again, the arrogance of power of a minority has undermined the actions of the majority" [*2277th meeting, para. 130*].

And he added:

> "When Namibia achieves liberation, then we shall differentiate between those who stood with us during the days of the bitter struggle and those who actively participated in the depletion of our mineral resources, armed and supported our enemy and belittled our sacred cause." [*Ibid., para. 134.*]

47. Had the course of action we proposed at that time been followed, had pressure upon South Africa been continued and had proposals been made periodically to the Council to adopt sanctions, it would have been possible to eliminate ambiguities and resolve contradictions. There would have been a gradual breakdown of resistance to the application of sanctions, and such measures would have finally been adopted.

48. The firmness of the international majority and its unswerving commitment to principles would have unequivocally defined the political dimensions of the question and would perhaps have made it possible to change the course of events in southern Africa. Moreover, the effectiveness of this body would have been upheld, in the case of Namibia as well as with regard to others of extreme gravity in which the impotence of the Council has had tragic consequences.

49. There is still time to act and to safeguard the primary role of this body. The most recent events in Namibia and the reactions to South Africa's intransigence in all democratic and progressive sectors throughout the world facilitate international unanimity and would, if we wished, make it possible to negotiate and adopt a draft resolution calling for sanctions.

50. Such a decision would constitute the best means of supporting the legislative decisions and political actions that are being taken in many countries to isolate South Africa. By acting in this way, the Council would be lending a decisive impetus to the process of adopting sanctions now under way in many countries, despite the hesitancy of the Council, a process that deserves our complete support.

51. The meetings held by the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as the relevant information we receive daily, reveal a discernible trend in international public opinion in favour of immediate sanctions against South Africa. To ignore that universal call, to fail to respond to it promptly, would be to act irresponsibly, to say the least, and to relegate the Security Council to the sidelines of history.

52. We believe it highly unlikely that at this juncture any State member can have any valid reason for objecting to the application of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We cannot imagine that any Government would cast doubt upon its own responsibility by isolating itself and by refusing to act in accordance with the law in the case of conduct that so flagrantly violates human freedoms and the basic principles of international morality.

53. For that reason, the General Assembly, in resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981, strongly urged the Security Council to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by immediately imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

54. At the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April of this year, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries affirmed that if South Africa persisted in its intransigence there could be "no other option but the imposition against it of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter" [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex, para. 28*]. That intransigence, to which the Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement referred, has been clearly demonstrated since then, as the Council itself has acknowledged.

55. During its extraordinary plenary meetings, held at Vienna last week under the chairmanship of the representative of Guyana, Mr. Noel Sinclair, the United Nations Council for Namibia considered in depth the present situation and explored the most appropriate ways and means of speeding the achievement of a solution to the conflict. In this connection, it recalled the Security Council's duty to ensure the implementation of its own resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978). It also considered—and this is a very important point—that the imposition of mandatory sanctions was the most effective means of ensuring compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on this question.

56. In the Programme of Action, contained in the Final Document which it adopted on 7 June [*S/17262 annex*], the United Nations Council for Namibia resolved to promote the imposition of sanctions at the current meetings of the Security Council and urged the permanent members of this body which have shielded South Africa in the past to demonstrate the necessary political will to implement those sanctions. The responsibility to promote the adoption of sanctions at this time by their very decision falls on all members of the United Nations Council for Namibia which approved that Programme. My own delegation assumes that responsibility with the greatest sense of duty and conviction.

57. The measures we adopt to isolate the South African régime must be effective and must be accompanied by appropriate means of verification. It is essential that all States, in particular those with the closest economic and political links to South Africa, implement them. There must be no escape clauses. If sanctions are not observed in practice, that would undermine the Security Council's authority and encourage those who have most resisted the application of the provisions under Chapter VII.

58. I should like to recall that the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in resolution 418 (1977) is still being violated, with the implicit tolerance of the Council, which has done little to strengthen the embargo and ensure its implementation.

59. In June 1980 [*resolution 473 (1980)*], the Council reiterated its appeal to all States to apply those sanctions strictly and rigorously and requested the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa to redouble its efforts to ensure the complete application of the embargo.

60. In response to that mandate, the Committee prepared a detailed and enlightening report which it submitted to the Council in September 1980 [*S/14179*]. Since then, the Council has avoided a debate and postponed taking action on that report which was prepared at its request and approved by the very members of the Council at the Committee level. In that document, various ways in which the embargo was violated were specified and precise measures were recommended to strengthen the embargo.

61. Before relinquishing the chairmanship of the Committee in September 1982, my delegation appeared before the Council once again to request that the report be taken up. Unfortunately, almost nothing has been done in all this time.

62. Now that Trinidad and Tobago has assumed the chairmanship of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa, I appeal respectfully to your delegation, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council to proceed without delay to reconsider strengthening the arms embargo against South Africa and take the necessary measures in this respect. Only in this way will our acts match our words.

63. We are aware of the practical difficulties involved in applying sanctions against States. We know that in the

short term important economic interests may be affected and that there may even be immediate negative consequences for neighbouring countries. None the less, none of those considerations should prevail over the urgent need to return to the Charter its stature, to the Council its authority and to the United Nations its prestige.

64. The observance of principles has a price which all States have agreed to pay, when necessary, in order to safeguard international peace and security. The independence and dignity of nations also on occasion are won at a high cost that all free countries are prepared to bear.

65. The Council will have before it a draft resolution which, I am confident, will be adopted unanimously. Regardless of the final result of this debate, South Africa's isolation should not be subject to further delays that might lead to undue concessions. The most honourable way of commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is to place all the power of Member States at the service of the prompt independence of Namibia and in favour of the abolition of racism and colonial exploitation, which are fundamentally in opposition to the very essence of the United Nations.

66. Mr. SORZANO (United States of Americ): It is indeed a pleasure for my country and for me personally to welcome you, Sir, the representative of an exemplary democracy, to the Council. Trinidad and Tobago is a shining example of how strong democratic institutions and principles serve simultaneously to foster respect for human rights and economic development. It is fitting that Trinidad and Tobago should honour the office of the presidency by sending one of its most capable and eminent public servants to guide the Council as it undertakes such important discussions. We note also that you bring to our proceedings a wealth of international experience in economic and political affairs which has distinguished your illustrious career.

67. We wish once again to pay tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand and to the representative of Thailand for the excellent manner in which the Council was led during the month of May.

68. We welcome this opportunity for the Council to meet once again to review developments in Namibia. We can all agree that the Council bears a unique responsibility for this troubled Territory and for moving it rapidly to internationally accepted independence. This is a responsibility we in the United States take seriously, and it is, moreover, a hope we have laboured diligently over many years to bring to fruition.

69. Namibia is a subject on which there is a wide area of international consensus. Foremost among these points of agreement is the need to bring the Territory to independence in accordance with Council resolution 435 (1978). The United States remains dedicated to this goal. We remain actively involved in negotiations to create conditions to allow implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed. We are heartened also by the reaffirmations of support for resolution 435 (1978) that we have heard from others over the past days—in particular, reaffirmations by the parties and countries more deeply concerned: the front-line States, South Africa, SWAPO, members of the contact group and others. Namibia is an issue on which the Council, acting on behalf of the international community, should be prepared to send a strong and unified message. Our goals and our directions are clear: we should not allow extraneous issues to divide us.

70. As we meet this week on Namibia, we find ourselves at a very serious juncture. This is the first time the Council has met in formal session to discuss the question of Namibia in 19 months. These are months in which we have seen substantial progress towards a Namibia settlement. We have seen developments which seem to bring into question the commitment of some to proceed with implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

71. It is one of these developments which prompted the call for the current meeting of the Council—specifically, the announced intention by South Africa to establish an "interim government" in Namibia. The United States has made its view on this "interim government" absolutely clear. Our statement on that subject, issued by the Department of State on 19 April 1985, declares that:

> "it has long been our position, and that of our contact group partners, that any purported transfer of power that might take place now or in future to bodies established in Namibia by South Africa is null and void. Such institutions will have, as Secretary Shultz stated on 16 April, no standing. We have not recognized them in the past and will not do so now. Our negotiating effort continues with the Governments concerned. Thus, we view the announcement regarding internal administrative arrangements inside Namibia as without effect on these negotiations or the agreements already achieved thereunder." [*See S/17119, annex.*]

72. We were also pleased to join in the statement by the Council on 3 May [*S/17151*] that was consistent with this position. It is clear that no internal settlement can succeed as long as the international community and the Council stand together and oppose it. In this regard, it is important that we speak with one voice. We must reaffirm that no settlement outside the framework of resolution 435 (1978) is acceptable. We must be prepared to reject any attempt by any party to impose such a settlement.

73. While the "interim government" has not been presented as an independent authority representing an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978), this is not sufficient. The international community is entirely justified in rejecting the creation of institutions which have no standing and can serve no conceivable purpose if the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is intended.

74. In our view, all Namibians should have the right to be heard, to express their views freely, to form political parties. They also have the right, as provided in resolution 435 (1978), to stand for election to represent their people. By the same token, however, none can be permitted to take power into their own hands or to proclaim themselves the

leaders of the Namibian people or the government of Namibia. Rather, it is for the people of Namibia to choose their own leaders in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control. This remains our goal.

75. In the absence of Namibian independence, the scourge of war has continued to afflict the region. A major goal of my Government in southern Africa has been to reduce the level of violence, and especially cross-border violence.

76. It was our goal of reducing violence and tension and ending cross-border operations that led us over a year ago to the negotiations that resulted in the Lusaka accord. That agreement was intended to give new impetus to the negotiations to stop the violence between Angolan and South African forces and to end the presence of outside forces in southern Angola. Those objectives were essentially achieved, and the violence that preceded the agreement was followed by 12 months of peace and practical cooperation between Angola and South Africa. Cooperation continues between the military forces of South Africa and Angola along the Namibian border itself, and we are heartened also by South Africa's announced withdrawal of its troops from the dams at Ruacana and Calueque.

77. Nevertheless, the achievement has been marred by the recent incident at Cabinda, which my Government has condemned. Respect for the national sovereignty of all States and the inviolability of international borders is a key principle in international relations. The United States cannot condone violations of this principle in whatever direction they may be launched or in the name of whatever goal they be justified. In this regard, we deplore South African violations of Angolan territorial integrity. Violent actions across borders, be they military attacks, sabotage or terrorism against innocent civilians, can only serve to undermine the confidence necessary for the settlement of disputes. In this instance, they can only detract from the prospects of the early independence of Namibia.

78. Constructive progress towards the resolution of disputes is the only way to bring about progress towards peace in the region. There can be no military solutions. In our view, the events of recent weeks—including the incident at Cabinda—underscore the importance of an early and comprehensive settlement which would address the root causes of violence in the region.

79. A settlement, however, could be within our grasp, given sufficient will by the parties most concerned. Prior to the Council's last meetings on Namibia, the Secretary-General reported [*S/15943, para. 25*] that only one barrier remained to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), namely, South Africa's insistence on an agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Since that report was issued, we have seen substantial movement towards the resolution of this final key issue. By late last summer, it became clear that we had moved beyond the stage of rhetorical debate on the issues of "linkage"—that is, whether Cuban troop withdrawal and Namibian independence should be related. Cuban troop withdrawal is—as a practical matter, and with the support of all concerned—being discussed in the context of implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In November 1984, the Angolan Government, for the first time, put a detailed and concrete negotiation proposal on the table [*S/16838*]. This major step forward was followed by a South African proposal [*S/16839, annex*]. The two proposals showed agreement between South Africa and Angola on a number of broad principles.

80. My Government has been involved for the past several months in intensive discussions with the two parties aimed at narrowing the remaining gap between their positions. We remain convinced that the gap can be bridged. Even in the wake of the events of the past days, it is our view that the door clearly remains open to a settlement and the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The United States, for one, remains committed to pursuing the search for peace for as long as there is prospect for success. The only alternative would be to acquiesce in continued war and suffering for the people of the region.

81. My Government notes that the Secretary-General's latest report [*S/17242*] confirms that the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola remains unchanged. The Secretary-General has urged all parties to make a new and determined effort to expedite implementation. My Government will take this call by the Secretary-General seriously, as we have in the past, and continue our efforts to bring the parties together.

82. I should like to pay special tribute to the Secretary-General for his role in pursuing the task given to him in resolution 435 (1978). We have admired his unstinting efforts to bridge the gap separating the contending parties, in order to bring about independence for Namibia under that resolution. My Council has co-operated closely with the Secretary-General in this effort and, in turn, has kept him fully informed of our own efforts towards the same end, so that our actions are mutually reinforcing.

83. Enormous problems of confidence and trust must be overcome to achieve a settlement. Each party must make difficult decisions regarding its security, its relations with its neighbours and its very future. These issues involve important questions of political will. These are the real decisions before the parties today as we debate the issue of Namibia. The answers they give will determine the future course of events not only in Namibia but throughout the region. It is up to us, as members of the Security Council, to give them every encouragement to make the right decisions, to abandon violence and to choose instead the path of peace.

84. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

85. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that your well-known ability as Minister for Foreign Affairs of your

friendly country will assist the Council to complete its tasks.

86. We wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, our friend the representative of Thailand, who displayed remarkable talent during his presidency of the Council last month.

87. We cannot but praise the Secretary-General for his efforts in the preparation of his valuable report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia.

88. Kuwait attaches the greatest importance to the Council's current discussion of the situation in Namibia. Unfortunately, pressing engagements prevent the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmed Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, from participating in these deliberations. He has conferred upon me the important responsibility of supporting the joint effort undertaken by his colleagues in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the basis of a specific mandate from the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April of this year. In its call for the convening of these meetings, the Non-Aligned Movement stresses its grave concern about the question of Namibia, its persistent quest for peace and justice, and its pioneering role in defence of peoples under occupation.

89. The Council's deliberations are taking place not only because of that concern; they also reflect and reaffirm the responsibility of the international community for the Namibian people. The question of Namibia is a primary responsibility of the United Nations. It is therefore the duty of the international community to take a frank and clear position on that question and its evolution.

90. The situation in southern Africa is fraught with threats to international peace and security. On the political level, we are faced with a régime which has made prevarication and intransigence the cornerstone of its policy. It has shown shrewdness in the delaying tactics it has employed to evade a peaceful settlement of the issue. The policies of the racist régime are exemplified by its intention to install on 17 June a so-called interim government in Namibia, having invited parliamentarians from Western countries to participate in the celebration of that sham. On the economic level, we are faced with a régime which, strengthened by foreign economic interests, has persisted in exploiting and depleting the natural resources of Namibia. On the military level, we are faced with a régime which has turned to policies of intimidation and repression in Namibia and aggression against neighbouring countries. Among the aspects of those policies are the imposition by the Government of South Africa of compulsory conscription for all Namibian males, that Government's military manoeuvres inside Namibia, its infiltration into Angolan territory notwithstanding its claim to have withdrawn its forces from that area, and its attempts to carry out sabotage and destabilization in that country.

91. It is clear that the present situation is favourable to South Africa, especially since we witness the Pretoria régime pursuing its policies in spite of all the pressure exerted upon it. That régime has obtained frequent guarantees and promises that the international community will never impose sanctions against it. But is is not only from such guarantees that the Pretoria régime gains its sense of security; there have also been open, explicit declarations based upon the policy of one of the parties playing a fundamental role in the search for a settlement. I refer, of course, to the United States policy of "constructive engagement" with the Pretoria régime.

92. That policy has strengthened and bolstered the *apartheid* régime, rather than bringing pressure to bear on it, as demanded by the situation. We are apprehensive about the United States position and its linkage of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. That linkage runs counter to the provisions of resolution 435 (1978), as reiterated by the Council in its resolution 539 (1983). That position will undoubtedly assist South Africa to carry out its plan to impede talks on the achievement of a settlement.

93. South Africa is exploiting that situation and that position in order to continue its hegemony over Namibia and extend it throughout the region. It is determined to impose its own interpretation of the settlement plan together with the form of government it believes should be at the helm in Namibia. Moreover, it persists in interfering in neighbouring countries in an attempt to define their choice of allies and political systems. We vigorously condemn that policy. We believe that the States, that, through their well-known policies, strengthen the racist régime in South Africa should have responded favourably to the demands for pressure on that régime and, even more, should have supported the efforts made to that end.

94. Kuwait supports the Council resolution on the prohibition of the export and import of arms to and from South Africa. It calls for increasing the scope of that resolution so that it will include other sectors, particularly oil and investments. Furthermore, Kuwait calls for finding ways and means to guarantee implementation of that resolution, and it expresses its readiness to participate in all efforts in that regard. I should like to recall that Kuwait, when it was a member of the Council, attempted to produce a solution in the matter of the arms embargo, and two years ago it participated in defining the different aspects of the oil embargo.

95. Because of the policies of South Africa, the Namibian people have indeed made great sacrifices. Yet, despite its grave difficulties, the Namibian people, through its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, has proved its commitment to peaceful settlement, Kuwait, for its part, has consistently supported the noble stand taken by that organization and has endeavoured to strengthen its ties and relations with it. These endeavours have been marked by the recent visit of President Sam Nujoma to Kuwait, following the New Delhi meeting last April.

96. We deem it necessary at this crucial stage for the Council to establish firmly the full responsibility of the United Nations for the process of Namibia's accession to independence. As the Council is duty-bound to implement its resolutions, it should adopt a clear position towards the defiance of its efforts in that regard; it should reaffirm its resolutions so as to guarantee the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the only basis for a peaceful settlement. The Council should reject any departure from the provisions of that resolution and any attempts to undermine a peaceful settlement. The Council is called upon to adopt effective measures to that effect. We hope that its deliberations will yield results that will advance peaceful efforts.

97. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Vice-Minister for Foreign Relations of Panama, Mr. Cabrera Jovane. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. CABRERA JOVANE (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. In the few days in which you have presided over this important United Nations organ you have enhanced the well-deserved prestige you enjoy in the international community. We are all the more pleased since you are a representative of Trinidad and Tobago, an outstanding country of our own region, with which Panama has indissoluble geographic, ethnic, historical and cultural ties.

99. I should like to congratulate the representative of Thailand on the able and distinguished manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

100. The question of Namibia has a special place among the main concerns in Panama's foreign policy. This is so because the question of Namibia embodies fundamental principles which the international community has been establishing in its unceasing efforts to ensure a world of peace, freedom and social justice.

101. For that reason, we have unreservedly supported the decision by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries to call for these urgent meetings of the Council; we feel particularly honoured that the Bureau authorized Panama, together with 17 other members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to participate in this debate. We do so deeply convinced of the seriousness of the situation that has brought us here and profoundly alarmed at the intensification of unlawful acts by the racist Government of South Africa, which, in repeated demonstrations of its open defiance of the overwhelming will of the international community, persists in placing new obstacles in the path of Namibia's attainment of independence.

102. Panama, a full-fledged member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, has affirmed its recognition of the principles and norms of international law and therefore bases its international policy on those principles and, in particular, on the legal equality of States, regardless of size or might, the right of peoples to self-determination, the peaceful settlement of international disputes, the elimination of the threat or use of force in international relations, and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States. Thus, we condemn colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and all forms of domination, subjugation or discrimination based on differences of sex, nationality, race, social class, religion or political ideology.

103. These meetings of the Council to consider the question of Namibia happen to coincide with the commemoration of important dates on the United Nations calendar of decolonization, giving us an opportunity to give serious thought to the role played by the United Nations in this field, as well as to the prospects for the immediate future.

104. A period of 19 years has gone by since the General Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, and since the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for administration of the Territory and for the preparation of a programme which would enable its people to exercise its right to self-determination.

105. Today is the seventeenth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2372 (XXII), which gave the Security Council the responsibility of adopting urgent measures under the Charter to ensure "the immediate removal of the South African presence from Namibia and to secure for Namibia its independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI)".

106. My country has no doubt that sufficient time has elapsed and that we have considered all the possible means for an orderly and peaceful transition of Namibia to independent life within a united and integrated territory. The international community has exceeded all the acceptable bounds of patience on this issue, while the Namibian people continue to pay a very high price in bloodshed and sacrifice, for the sole reason that they aspire to live in peace and freedom in an independent and democratic Namibia.

107. In spite of the present serious situation, the South African Government has sought to take further dangerous steps, which not only obstruct the implementation of the categorical decisions of the Council with regard to Namibia but also openly contravene resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) and relevant decisions of the General Assembly, thus seriously endangering international peace and security.

108. The South African régime's decision to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia, in flagrant disregard of provisions of the Council on this matter, constitutes a further defiance of the express will of the community of nations, defiance to which the Council should respond with exemplary determination.

109. Panama associates itself with the unanimous rejection by the international community of this new manoeuvre of the racist régime and expresses its support for the

Final Document adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April of this year [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*], a meeting whose decisions have been eloquently presented to the Council by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of India, Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan [*2583rd meeting*].

110. Today, as in the past, it is right to stress the special responsibility of the United Nations with respect to the people and Territory of Namibia, as has been recognized by the Council in various resolutions. Given this indisputable fact, South Africa's intransigence makes it more urgent than ever for the United Nations effectively to shoulder its responsibility and act with determination in accordance with the Charter so that the people of Namibia may attain genuine, internationally recognized independence in a united Namibia, with complete territorial integrity, a Namibia that includes the Caprivi Strip, Walvis Bay and the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands.

111. That is why Panama is appearing before the Council to add its voice to the demands of the community of nations for an immediate end to the Pretoria régime's illegal occupation of Namibia and for the adoption, once and for all, of urgent measures to implement, without further delay or pre-conditions, the United Nations plan for Namibia, as endorsed in Council resolution 435 (1978).

112. In that respect, my country categorically rejects any attempt by the South African régime to impose internal, unilateral settlements of the Namibian question, and we firmly support the statement made by the President of the Council on 3 May 1985, on behalf of all its members [*S/17151*], that any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside of resolution 435 (1978) is unacceptable and that the establishment of the so-called interim government in Namibia is null and void.

113. My delegation reaffirms its unceasing solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and we are happy to greet its President, Sam Nujoma, whose cause we regard as our own.

114. We also reiterate our solidarity with the front-line States, suffering systematic aggression by the Pretoria régime, and express to them our appreciation of the valuable contribution they are making to the struggle for the final elimination of colonialism in southern Africa and for the eradication of *apartheid*.

115. My country reaffirms its complete support for the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence, and we express our appreciation of, and support for, the self-sacrificing work done by the Council to promote the prompt independence of Namibia.

116. The Secretary-General deserves our warmest tribute for his indefatigable perseverance and exemplary tenacity in the cause of Namibia's independence. We believe that his contribution is of the greatest importance in promoting the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without delay or conditions and without any linkage to questions unrelated to those explicity set out by the Security Council.

117. The time has come to move from words to deeds. There is an urgent need for all States Members to act in accordance with the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly with regard to Namibia and take the necessary measures to isolate the racist régime of South Africa and bring about Namibia's independence without delay. However, we wish to point out that, for the accomplishment of this task, it is up to the Council to shoulder with determination its prime responsibility to deal with situations that, as is the case with the one we are considering, seriously threaten both regional and international peace and security.

118. This year, as we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Magna Carta of decolonization, the members of the Council, and in particular its permanent members, bear the heavy responsibility of proving worthy of the great trust that mankind, represented by the States Members, has placed in them.

119. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

120. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June and to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the efficient manner in which he conducted the Council's business last month.

121. Poland, as one of the co-founders of the United Nations and a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence, is deeply concerned about Namibia, as well as about the situation throughout the region. That is why Poland welcomed the convening of these urgent meeting of the Security Council.

122. The high-level representation of some States members of the Council and of the States that have asked to be allowed to express their views emphasizes the gravity of the situation. That gravity stems from tensions and insecurity created by South Africa's policies, its armed aggression against neighbouring States, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its defiance of the United Nations and, indeed, of the international community as a whole.

123. The statements made by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as those by Mr. Noel Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of

SWAPO, are a sharp reminder of the plight of the Namibian people.

124. These meetings are also a reminder that special responsibility rests with the Security Council to act without further delay. The whole complex of United Nations decisions, including, first, Council resolution 435 (1978), should show the ways and means to ensure the transition of Namibia from South African rule to statehood, in conjunction with United Nations-supervised elections.

125. Guided by those decisions and by the principles of its own foreign policy, Poland rejects "linkage", "parallelism" or a so-called internal settlement, as yet another of South Africa's and its collaborators' games aimed at prolonging the colonial occupation of Namibia.

126. My Government fully shares the indignation of the United Nations Council for Namibia and supports its communiqué, adopted at Vienna on 5 June, regarding Pretoria's plan to install a puppet administration in Namibia [*see S/17262, annex*].

127. In that connection, it is our opinion that the Security Council should fully assume its responsibility, condemn such delaying manoeuvres and enforce implementation of its own resolutions without modification or qualification. If South Africa continues to show no willingness to cooperate and continues its cynical disregard for those decisions and opinions of the United Nations, the non-aligned countries and the Organization of African Unity, the Council should urgently and with determination undertake more concrete measures envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

128. The intransigence of the Pretoria régime, and its political manipulations together with some of its supporters, should be curbed; Council resolution 418 (1977), which calls for an arms embargo against South Africa, should be strengthened; Decree No. 1[1] of the United Nations Council for Namibia should be strictly enforced. The statement by South Africa's representative on 10 June before this Council [*2583rd meeting*], a statement characterized by arrogance and cynicism, convinced us only of the urgency of those steps and their utmost importance.

129. We do not believe that a durable peace can be achieved until all the remnants of colonialism and the inhuman system of *apartheid* are removed and the illegal occupation of Namibia ends.

130. It is our sincere hope and our earnest expectation—as it is the hope of the Namibian people and their authentic representative, SWAPO—that these meetings of the Council will contribute to that cause.

131. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Cyprus. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

132. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): At the outset I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. We feel happy that the presidency is in the hands of a representative of a country with which we are bound by the affinity of belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and to the Commonwealth. Your vast experience and renowned diplomatic skills give us the assurance that under your presidency the Council will be able to live up to its important responsibilities in once again considering the situation in Namibia and doing justice to its people.

133. I should also like to pay a special tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

134. Twenty-five years have passed since the General Assembly adopted the epoch-making resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

135. Forty years have passed since the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations, which created an international organization whose primary purpose is to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to safeguard fundamental freedoms.

136. For 100 years the people of Namibia have been struggling for the realization of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence and for the abolishment of the abhorrent yoke of colonialism and the degrading system of *apartheid* imposed upon them by the Pretoria régime.

137. Meeting here on the anniversaries of such important historical developments, and considering that mankind is on the threshold of the twenty-first century, the obligation and responsibility placed on our shoulders to assist the people of Namibia in their efforts to attain their precious goal of freedom and national independence are both immense and pressing.

138. The case of Namibia is a clear case of colonialism, racism and foreign occupation and oppression, which are allowed to persist in flagrant violation of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people and in defiance of the very authority of the United Nations. The Organization faces serious responsibilities, for Namibia is the only Territory placed under its direct administering authority. Yet the resultant stalemate in the situation in Namibia obviously raises the question of the credibility of the United Nations because of the inability of the Organization to give effect to the resolutions of its principal organs and because of the compelling need to take the measures expressly provided for in the Charter, thus giving substance and validity to the Organization.

139. If South Africa, or any other aggressor or occupying Power which, through its acts, threatens international peace and security, is allowed arrogantly and with disdain to flout the repeated calls of the international community, and if the United Nations cannot ensure the implementation of its own decisions, the Organization cannot function effectively, and its very concept, or even its very existence, is in jeopardy.

140. Non-implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations is the essence of the Namibian situation and other similar cases. It is the root cause of the perpetuation of all unsolved and proliferating international problems. The forces of aggression and injustice are allowed to prevail over the principles of freedom and justice, thus adding to the escalation of already explosive situations, with unforeseen consequences, to the detriment of international peace and security. It is therefore not resolutions alone, however masterfully drafted, that can bring the solution of problems closer and lead to the achievement of desired goals; it is their effective implementation that is of paramount importance.

141. That is why my delegation strongly holds the view that Council resolution 435 (1978), which reflects the international consensus on this issue and provides the solid basis for a peaceful solution to the problem, should be implemented immediately. To this end, we join our voice with the voices of previous speakers in appealing to the Secretary-General to convene a meeting of the parties concerned—SWAPO and South Africa—to finalize details in connection with the active implementation of that resolution.

142. On the occasion of SWAPO's twenty-fifth anniversary, Cyprus would like to reiterate its brotherly solidarity with and support for SWAPO and its leadership and for the heroic people of Namibia struggling valiantly for their liberation from the oppression of the colonial Power, the racist South African régime.

143. The Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi last April, evaluated the situation in and relating to Namibia and considered ways by which the non-aligned countries could further intensify their solidarity with and assistance to SWAPO and the Namibian people. We endorse the Programme of Action it adopted [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*].

144. That important meeting, and the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held at Vienna last week, meetings which are taking place in the context of the intensification of our endeavours to achieve speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) aimed at the achievement of independence for the Territory, coincide with the decision of the South African *apartheid* régime to establish a so-called Multi-Party Conference and an interim government, against the will of the Namibian people.

145. We once again reject as null and void any such attempts by the South African régime to circumvent the United Nations plan for the immediate independence of Namibia. In a rare show of unity, the international community adopted that plan of action as providing the only acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia. Responsibility for its non-implementation rests with the South African régime.

146. At the same time, we reject the imposition by the occupation régime of South Africa of military conscription upon the Namibian people and the declaration of the northern region of Namibia as a "security zone", and we call for the immediate and unconditional release of all Namibian political prisoners held by the South Africans in prisons and concentration camps.

147. The Government of Cyprus, which is an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, has consistently and fervently supported the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, led by their sole authentic representative, SWAPO, for independence in a united Namibia. We have extended all possible support in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and in the United Nations. We remain steadfastly committed to the goal of an independent, united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands, and other offshore islands. We hold firmly to the view that this goal should be achieved in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization. It is the duty of all of us to redouble our efforts to help the Namibian people in realizing their goals. It is the duty of the five members of the Western contact group to see that their initiative in favour of a genuine political solution in Namibia is carried out to its logical conclusion.

148. Cyprus, for its part, will continue to join the intensified efforts of the international community until Namibia becomes truly independent on the basis of resolution 435 (1978), which provides the only acceptable solution of the Namibian problem.

149. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

150. Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The Laotian delegation would like to extend to you, Sir, its warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. We are sure that, under the guidance of such a distinguished representative of a peace-loving and justice-loving country whose sympathy for the cause of decolonization is so well known, the work of the Council will yield the results for which we all hope. My delegation would also like to express its gratitude to the Council for having granted its request to participate in the debate on this important question, entitled "The situation in Namibia".

151. We should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the remarkable manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Council last month.

152. Peoples and Governments throughout the world that cherish peace, freedom and justice have been following with concern and relief the debate now being held in the Council on the tragic situation in Namibia and in the whole of southern Africa because of the resurgence of acts of intimidation, repression, destabilization and aggression being perpetrated by the illegal and racist Pretoria régime. These peoples and Governments, together with the oppressed peoples of South Africa and occupied Namibia, have finally realized, with indignation and bitterness, that

the international community, the United Nations and, particularly, the Council, have been the dupes of a series of fraudulent moves carried out by the colonial and racist Pretoria régime. That diabolical régime has not only delayed the implementation of the United Nations plan for true independence for Namibia, as approved by Council resolution 435 (1978), it has totally undermined that plan, one which nevertheless, in the view of the international community and the United Nations, constitutes the only valid and acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

153. One more *fait accompli*—or, rather, a further criminal act—has just been committed by Pretoria against the oppressed people of Namibia and SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, whose President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, made a particularly moving statement before the Council last Monday [*2583rd meeting*].

154. Several speakers, including the acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence, have already told the Council that the formal establishment of a puppet administration is scheduled for 17 June in the Namibian capital. We know that everyone, including the United States and other friends and allies of the criminal Pretoria régime, have been condemning and denouncing that illegal act and those responsible for it. However, we must not allow ourselves to be lulled by soft words and insincere professions of faith. We must be in a position and have the courage to denounce and condemn both the author of that criminal act and its most notorious accomplices and paymasters.

155. Like the President of SWAPO and other speakers here, the Laotian Government unreservedly condemns the policy of "constructive engagement" with *apartheid* South Africa that has been pursued for almost five years by the United States Government. It is precisely that policy of "destructive engagement"—to use the words of President Nujoma—that has consolidated the system of *apartheid* and encouraged Pretoria to adopt an attitude of arrogance, defiance and intransigence towards the entire international community. It is that policy of destructive engagement and appeasement that has incited and encouraged the racist Pretoria régime to trample underfoot with impunity a considerable number of resolutions and decisions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, including resolution 435 (1978), which, as we know, endorses the United Nations plan for the true independence of Namibia.

156. Pretoria's reprehensible actions thus seriously weaken the authority and the moral and political credibility of the United Nations, and particularly of its supreme organ, the Security Council, because the question of Namibia falls especially within the competence and direct responsibility of the Organization.

157. Everyone was pleased when, on 3 May of this year, the Council issued a statement [*S/17151*] condemning and rejecting as null and void the decision taken by Pretoria on 18 April to set up a puppet administration in Namibia, a Territory which it continues to occupy illegally, in flagrant violation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice. However, verbal condemnation, no matter how energetic, cannot suffice in this case. Only concerted, decisive and binding measures can, in our view, act as a deterrent to the guilty party.

158. In the past few months the international community has witnessed an escalation of tension and violence in South Africa and Namibia, and throughout southern Africa, because of a whole series of acts of intimidation, repression, destabilization and aggression committed by the racist and colonial régime of Pretoria against the oppressed masses in those countries as well as independent States of the area.

159. It is clear, as was stated here by the President of SWAPO, that the policy of State terrorism at present being pursued so frenetically by the illegal racist Pretoria régime is aimed ultimately not only at perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia and plundering with impunity the vast human and natural resources of that Territory, but also at bantustanizing it.

160. It is tragic and immoral that the United States, certain Western military-industrial Powers and the Zionist régime should continue to support that diabolical régime openly, covertly or through transnational corporations. That explains the intransigence and persistence with which the *apartheid* régime has made the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence dependent on withdrawal from Angola of the internationalist Cuban contingent.

161. We know that the Government of Angola, the international community and the Council have on more than one occasion categorically repudiated this pre-condition known as "linkage", which is entirely extraneous to the subject with which we are concerned.

162. The international community is duty-bound to demand that Pretoria withdraw immediately and unconditionally its forces of occupation and aggression from southern Africa. It was with profound indignation that the international community learned that the representative of the illegal racist Pretoria régime—as is made clear in the further report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia [*S/17242*]—made so bold as to tell the Secretary-General, on 26 April 1985, a pack of lies when informing him that the process of disengagement of the South African forces of aggression from southern Angola had been completed.

163. Those lies were conclusively exposed by the message from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola [*S/17246, annex*], describing the act of aggression and sabotage committed on 21 May by South African "commandos" in the Malongo region, province of Cabinda. Those "commandos" were, in fact, taken prisoner by the people's liberation forces of Angola.

164. That is the true face of the racist South African régime, a régime which, as we have seen, an imperialist, expansion coalition that includes international reactionaries continues to support. In this regard, a recent report from Agence France Presse, drawing on South African sources in Johannesburg, informed us that the leaders of the Angolan, Nicaraguan, Afghan, Laotian and Khmer Pol Pot criminal and counter-revolutionary organizations were to meet in the main base of UNITA [União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola], near the Namibian frontier.

165. That news should not surprise us because it is public knowledge that these imperialists, expansionists, racists, Zionists and international reactionary forces still continue to pursue a belligerent policy of provocation, intervention, all forms of sabotage, oppression, repression and direct aggression against independent, sovereign countries and peoples and, indeed, the oppressed peoples and their national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

166. These diabolical forces still continue to make use of traitors and counter-revolutionaries in the countries concerned, with the support and criminal complicity of the extreme right and expansionist circles in certain neighbouring countries. The case of my own country is a good example of that. We ourselves were victims of the same manoeuvres used against Namibia and the front-line States in southern Africa.

167. To come back to the problem of Namibia, the international community, and in particular the Security Council, which has primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations to preserve and promote international peace and security, should take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of its own decisions and, in the case of recalcitrance, obstruction or continued defiance by the illegal racist Pretoria régime, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

168. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that, wishing to accelerate the process of the accession to genuine independence by the oppressed people of Namibia, in keeping with the spirit and the letter of Council resolution 435 (1978), the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, which was held from 19 to 21 April 1985 at New Delhi and in which my country participated, adopted a Declaration and a Programme of Action of great importance [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*].

169. My delegation hopes that the Council, which has been convened at the express request of that meeting, will fully take account of the judicious recommendations contained in those documents. By way of conclusion I shall, with the Council's permission, quote the following passage from the statement made at the New Delhi meeting by the head of our delegation:

> "The Lao people, having suffered a long and painful colonial past and knowing full well the cost of a national liberation struggle against colonialist and imperialist aggression and hegemonistic expansionism, would like to reaffirm its unswerving support for the valiant and tenacious struggle now being waged by the fraternal Namibian people, under the resolute and far-sighted leadership of SWAPO, to recover its inalienable rights to freedom, self-determination and independence.
>
> "We should also like to reaffirm our unswerving support and sympathy for the Governments and the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and the other front-line States, whose contribution to the Namibian cause has been so valuable."

170. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sri Lanka. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

171. Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): I should like at the outset to thank you, Sir, and the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in the debate. I would also like to take this opportunity warmly to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of the President of the Council for the month of June.

172. I wish also to pay tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for guiding the Council's deliberations with skill and efficiency last month.

173. It was the intention of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Mr. Hameed, to attend this meeting of the Council. Regrettably, pressing engagements at home have prevented his being here. He has requested me to make the following statement on his behalf:

> "The decision to convene these meetings of the Council to consider the situation in Namibia is most timely and necessary. Although Council resolution 435 (1978) endorses a comprehensive plan to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, seven frustrating years have passed since that resolution offered so much hope.
>
> "Sri Lanka believes in the continued validity of resolution 435 (1978) as the only blueprint for Namibian independence, and also believes that it should be implemented unaltered and without further delay. Extraneous conditions put forward, including the so-called linkage between Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, must be rejected, since they help to delay the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).
>
> "Sri Lanka recognizes SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.
>
> "The decision of South Africa to establish an interim government in Namibia can only obstruct and complicate the process towards independence.
>
> "Sri Lanka fully supports the efforts of the United Nations, particularly those of the Secretary-General,

and of the non-aligned group and the Organization of African Unity for a speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) so that the people of Namibia can exercise their right to self-determination and independence and take their long overdue place among the free nations of the world.

"I wish the deliberations of the Council all success."

174. Much has been said in the Security Council, the General Assembly and various other forums by those who are concerned with the fate of Namibia and the struggle of the valiant people of that country. The time is now opportune for the Council to assume its internationally recognized responsibility over that country and act swiftly in a decisive manner. It will be supported in this endeavour by the non-aligned group, the OAU and the overwhelming majority of the international community.

175. The best means of achieving independence for Namibia lies in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which endorses a detailed plan for this process. We recognize the role played by the contact group in negotiating this resolution and securing the agreement of all parties for its implementation when it was adopted in 1978. The people of Namibia have waited with the international community for the past seven years for the implementation of this resolution, but as of now there has in fact been no progress towards the goal of Namibian independence. It is an unfortunate fact that, apart from resolution 435 (1978), the international community has not done much to press home its political will to achieve the goal of Namibian independence. It is imperative at this stage for the Council to take decisive action for the following reasons.

176. During the last 40 years the United Nations has been preoccupied with Namibia without achieving any tangible result. The international community had every reason to be proud of resolution 435 (1978). Even South Africa, which stubbornly maintains its stranglehold on Namibia, went on record that resolution 435 (1978) was acceptable to it. What remained to be done after the adoption of that resolution was its implementation, which would have granted independence to the Territory under the plan endorsed in the resolution.

177. Adding to the sense of urgency is South Africa's plan, through the involvement of the Multi-Party Conference, to install a so-called interim government in Namibia on 17 June. The time is indeed opportune for the Council to take firm and positive steps to implement resolution 435 (1978). As far as the international community is concerned, the years of waiting are running out, and it now looks to the Security Council to assume its responsibility. This is all the more important in view of the position taken by South Africa in its *Aid-mémoire* of 18 April 1985, which states that:

"The South African Government is well aware of its responsibilities in South West Africa. They derive from its position that its presence and administration in the Territory are legal. There is no legally binding decision of the International Court of Justice, nor any decision of the United Nations taken in accordance with the Charter, to the contrary." [*See S/17152, annex, appendix I.*]

178. This statement confirms the stubborn and intransigent attitude of South Africa and its callous disregard of innumerable Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, including Council resolution 435 (1978), which reaffirms the legal responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and reiterates that its objective is the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration of Namibia and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations, in accordance with resolution 385 (1976). In addition to these resolutions, there is the insistent demand of the international community, both governmental and non-governmental, and the persuasions of the contact group.

179. The South African representative devoted a major portion of his statement made on 10 June to Angola rather than Namibia. He said that: "It is significant that participants in this debate this afternoon should have referred to developments in Angola in conjunction with the question of South West Africa" [*2583rd meeting, para. 205*].

180. What he failed to mention, however, was the fact that the overwhelming majority who had spoken on the question of Namibia in the past and during the current meetings of the Council have done so only to reject categorically the concept of linkage between the independence of Namibia, which is an issue of decolonization, and a decision taken by a sovereign country, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. I should like to reiterate the position of my Government that Sri Lanka totally rejects the linkage of extraneous issues to the independence of Namibia. If Angola was dragged into the discussion on the question of Namibia, it was done by those elements that saw an advantage to such a linkage. South Africa did not refer to the presence of foreign troops when accepting resolution 435 (1978).

181. In his statement, the South African representative declared that South Africa "will continue to search for a reasonable formula for genuine Cuban withdrawal from Angola. If a firm agreement can be reached in this regard, it will carry out its undertaking to implement the international settlement plan." [*Ibid., para. 215.*]

182. It is time for the Council to remind South Africa of resolution 264 (1969), which stated that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and called upon South Africa to withdraw immediately from Namibia. That was many years before Angola became independent and Cuba troops set foot in Angola.

183. It is a well-known fact that Namibia is endowed with vast mineral resources and that over the years these resources have been systematically exploited for the benefit of the few, depriving the indigenous people of Namibia of their inheritance. This exploitation runs on classic colonial lines, and not content with exploitation of natural resources, there is now a definitive attempt to exploit the human resources of that unfortunate country.

184. What we require from the Council at this stage is a plan that will grant independence to Namibia within a short period of time. To agree to anything less will only encourage South Africa to continue its intransigence, thus delaying the independence of Namibia, which will result in the destabilization of the entire region, with possible consequences for international peace and security.

185. The representative of South Africa indicated in his statement the desire of his country to resolve problems concerning the region through peaceful means rather than resort to violence. Peace that South Africa claims to seek with its neighbours will not be possible until Pretoria decides to withdraw from Namibia and remove the last vestiges of *apartheid* from South Africa.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTE

[1] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Special Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II).

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—June 1994—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2588th MEETING: 13 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2588)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia: (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213); (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222); (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2588th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 13 June 1985, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2588)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Davane (Mozambique),

Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mrs. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar a letter dated 12 June [*S/17264*] which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Mfanafuthi J. Makatini, head of the International Department and Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa, in connection with the Council's current consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council accedes to that request.

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. KURODA (Japan): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to express my appreciation for this opportunity to participate in the discussion of the question of Namibia, one of the most important long-standing matters ever to come before the United Nations. I should also like to extend to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June, and to commend you on the admirable manner in which you have been guiding the work.

8. The Security Council and General Assembly have adopted a number of resolutions on the question of Namibia. The front-line States, the contact group, the Secretary-General and other parties have been making serious efforts to resolve the issue and many countries, including my own, have applied strong pressure in a variety of areas, on South Africa. Nevertheless, South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia.

9. The independence of Namibia should be achieved by the will of its inhabitants through a free election under the supervision of the United Nations. To this end it is imperative that the parties concerned faithfully implement Council resolution 435 (1978).

10. The international community was encouraged in the summer of 1983 when, following a visit by the Secretary-General, South Africa expressed the view that the technical obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been removed. In early 1984 Pretoria promised to the Government of Angola that it would recall all South African troops which were deployed in Angolan territory. Regrettably, however, South Africa has at the same time been taking measures which block a solution of the problem.

11. First, South Africa has introduced the so-called linkage issue, while assuring the international community of its co-operation in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Japan's position is that the solution of the Namibian question must not be obstructed by any extraneous issues which are incompatible with resolution 435 (1978).

12. Secondly, it was recently revealed that South African military teams had been operating in northern Angola. This revelation has greatly damaged the credibility of the South African Government with regard to its intention to implement the Lusaka Agreement.

13. Thirdly, in defiance of international opinion, South Africa once again decided to set up what it claims to be an interim government in Namibia. But no country will take at face value the Government of South Africa's assurances that this is indeed "an interim mechanism for the internal administration of the Territory pending agreement on an internationally acceptable independence" [*see S/17152, appendix 2*].

14. As my Government has informed the Secretary-General [*S/17207*], Japan regards as null and void any measures taken by the Government of South Africa which are incompatible with resolution 435 (1978).

15. The Secretary-General's report issued last week [*S/17242*] clearly reflects the frustration the international community feels towards what has happened in these one and half years. My Government wholeheartedly supports the conclusions presented in that report.

16. In the light of this course of events, one can only conclude that the international community must for some time to come persevere in applying pressure upon South Africa wherever and however possible.

17. As is well known, Japan does not maintain diplomatic relations with South Africa. It does not engage in military or nuclear co-operation of any kind with South Africa. It prohibits direct investments in South Africa. It has called upon Japanese foreign-exchange banks and their branches abroad to refrain from extending any loans to South Africa. Moreover, Japan takes measures to enforce restrictions on cultural, educational and sports contacts with South African nationals in accordance with various United Nations resolutions. My Government has also brought to the attention of all relevant organizations and corporate executives in Japan the Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1] Japan will continue to enforce those measures until Namibia gains its independence. In this connection we believe that pressure on South Africa should be applied in a concerted manner with as broad participation of the international community as possible.

18. Dialogue among all parties concerned is still essential to the peaceful solution of the questio.i of Namibia. My Government highly values the diplomatic efforts which various countries have been making and earnestly hopes that they will be intensified in order to overcome the present impasse.

19. Those who are suffering most from this prolonged problem are, of course, the Namibian people under the occupation of South Africa, the Namibian refugees who have been forced out of their native land and the neighbouring countries which are accepting those refugees. Japan has long been extending humanitarian assistance to the Namibian people through funds and programmes administered by the United Nations. Japan will do so as long as the need continues. Moreover, when the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) comes into being Japan will extend various forms of co-operation, and after Namibian independence is achieved Japan will spare no effort in extending bilateral economic and technical co-operation throughout the nation-building period.

20. Finally, I should like to emphasize that, although the end of what has already been a long quest for Namibian independence is regrettably not yet in sight, if the international community continues to work in a spirit of unanimity and co-operation we shall surely reach our common goal. In this context Japan hopes that the current session of the Council will be conducted in a constructive manner and that it will result in a step forward in solving this tragic question of Namibia.

21. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia): I should like first of all to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for the courtesy accorded to my delegation in agreeing to our request to participate in these critical meetings on the question of Namibia.

23. My country is deeply committed to the struggle for freedom in Namibia. It is a morally just cause. A free Namibia is also essential for long-term peace and stability in southern Africa. In addition, Malaysia sees in recent years a further dimension to the question of Namibian independence. We see it as a symbol of the efforts of the international community to ensure the primacy of law over naked force and of diplomacy over national assertiveness in a world in which malaise, cynicism, lawlessness and assaults on the fragile structure of internationalism are an ominously rising tide.

24. For those reasons, Malaysia was honoured when it was designated by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, to attend the current meetings of the Council. Unfortunately, because of pressing and unavoidable business, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country is unable to be present here himself, a fact which he regrets. As a result, I now have the distinct privilege of participating in the debate. It gives me particular pleasure to do so when you, Sir, a diplomat of distinction and experience, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a democratic and non-aligned country, with which my own feels close affinity, is presiding over the Council's deliberations.

25. May I also take the liberty, Mr. President, although Malaysia is not a member of the Council, to express my warm admiration at the devoted and exceptionally professional and effective manner in which your immediate predecessor, the representative of Thailand, conducted the affairs of the Council in the month of May.

26. It is a tragic commentary on the United Nations that the question of Namibia has been before it for as long as the Organization itself has existed. The facts are too well known to require repetition in the Council and my remarks, therefore, will focus on two principal questions; first, does the Council believe that South Africa is serious about implementing resolution 435 (1978), which it adopted nearly eight years ago; secondly, if it does not, what does the Council propose to do about it; what does it take for the Council to act?

27. I may add two related questions which the Council should also ponder: how much longer does the Council expect the people of Namibia to wait for their freedom? What does the Council expect the Namibian people, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which the United Nations itself recognizes as its sole legitimate representative, to do in the meantime?

28. I turn then to the first of my two principal questions: is South Africa serious or simply playing games with resolution 435 (1978), a resolution, it will be recalled, which everyone in the Council has affirmed is the only basis for a peaceful settlement? The record of South Africa, I suggest, gives an entirely clear answer. It is a record of internal repression and regional destabilization with the objective of promoting an internal political settlement to suit its own purposes, namely, continued political control of Namibia, continued exploitation of its rich resources, and continued dominance in southern Africa by force of arms in order to ensure the preservation of its *apartheid* policies. In this exercise, it has exploited the bait of a strategic objective—which is not its own but which has enabled it to align itself to its most steadfast ally and to sabotage the settlement plan adopted in resolution 435 (1978).

29. Do I need to elaborate? Even those who feel an affinity with the South African régime for economic, strategic or emotional reasons must know that its policy in Namibia is one of systematic terror, harassment, intimidation, arbitrary arrest and detention and, yes, torture—which have all been amply documented by impartial observers, including Church organizations. And can anyone be unaware that South Africa, an industrial Power, with powerful friends, has openly embarked on a campaign of destabilization, including invasion and occupation of neighbouring States, commando raids and assassinations, military and logistical support for sabotage and terrorism by dissident groups, direct sabotage attacks and economic pressures?

30. Moreover, the situation in Namibia is unique in several ways. First, with the sole exception of South Africa

itself, every Member State, in conformity with the position taken by the International Court of Justice, regards South Africa's occupation of Namibia as illegal. I might add, parenthetically, that if the finding of the Court had been otherwise, how fervently would South Africa and its friends have proclaimed their adherence to the rule of law. Secondly, despite all the complexities of the situation, often artificially manufactured, there exists a carefully crafted settlement plan which was adopted by resolution 435 (1978). It may also be well to remind ourselves at this stage—or rather to remind the apologists for South Africa—that the South African régime is not democratic, that the South African régime is a dictatorship as far as the 22 million black South Africans, some 85 per cent of its population, are concerned. It is also brutal. It is also racist and, contrary to its claim, it is the very negation of civilized Western values.

31. If I appear to digress, it is because I want to demonstrate that whatever the law, whatever the opportunity for a settlement, it is in the very nature of the South African régime to oppose any settlement which does not preserve its own privileged position in southern Africa. Hence it has raised all manner of obstructions to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); hence it has resorted to all manner of provocations, of which the so-called interim government is only the latest example, in the hope that the other parties to the settlement plan would themselves abandon it. In the years since 1978, many of these obstructions have been removed by adroit diplomacy on the part of the Secretary-General and some members of the Council, and also—let it be emphasized—by the patience and good will shown by SWAPO and the other front-line States, which have refused to allow themselves to be provoked. But finally, of course, South Africa has raised the so-called linkage issue, a truly astounding demand. Even when that appears to be chipped away, South Africa becomes more rigid, more demanding and more arrogant.

32. I should like, if I may, to spend a little time on this infamous linkage issue. In all the years since this issue was raised—and raised, it bears repeating, well after the settlement plan was negotiated and agreed upon—there has never been any justification, or even any serious attempt at a justification, for raising the issue at all. For clearly there is none. It is simply a naked exercise in raw power. It is not even pretended that the Cuban troops pose a threat to South Africa. To the contrary, it is South Africa which has invaded Angola. Here indeed is the thug which says that its victim should not have the means to protect itself. Here is South Africa, a country which all acknowledge is in illegal occupation of Namibia, which all know has invaded Angola and which, as recently as 21 May, has conducted a mission of economic sabotage deep inside Angola. Here is that country attempting to dictate the terms of a settlement. The truly extraordinary thing is that some are willing to entertain—no, are encouraging and abetting—this outrageous demand. And, if linkage is to be justified, what next? Perhaps it will be alleged that Angola is not sufficiently pluralistic? Or perhaps that Angola is maintaining unacceptably close relations with one country or another? In his statement to the Council on 10 June the representative of the South African régime talked openly of the need for the people of Angola—I repeat Angola—to exercise their right to self-determination. Is it not clear what the next obstacle would be?

33. It must be obvious, therefore, that this so-called linkage is a subterfuge which is only a means to achieve South Africa's own objective, namely, an internal settlement of the question of Namibia on its own terms. The Council—every member of the Council—must therefore make clear what its own objective is. Is it the exercise by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination? Is it the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola? Is it the continued protection of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa? Is it the emergence of a more ideologically acceptable régime in Namibia and, perhaps, even in Angola?

34. I am aware that the world is a very complicated place and that here in this chamber sit some very sophisticated diplomats. We all understand the realities of power, of national interest and of strategic objectives. We all understand that, often, motives are not undiluted and objectives not unmixed. But the Council must not let sophistication become mere sophistry. If the United Nations stands for anything at all, it must stand for certain principles. The question which all must answer, therefore, is this: Are the rights of the Namibian people, who have suffered so much for so long, merely secondary to some other strategic objective? If so, what value, then, should we place on avowals about freedom, self-determination, equality and human rights?

35. The current meetings are therefore crucial in determining where the Council—ever member of it—stands on this fundamental issue of principle. And, in the face of South Africa's deliberate obstruction, its record of evasion, provocation and subterfuge, what will the Council do? Already, the Council has adopted some 21 resolutions on Namibia. Among other things, the Council has declared that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and that South Africa must withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory [*resolution 264 (1969)*]: that was in 1969. It has condemned the decision of the South African Government to hold elections in Namibia in December 1978 as contravening its earlier resolutions: that was in 1978. It has reiterated its demand that South Africa should co-operate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978) and has even warned South Africa that "its failure to do so would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions" [*resolution 439 (1978)*]. That, again, was in 1978. The Council has condemned South Africa for its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and has rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues [*resolution 539 (1983)*]: that was in 1983. And as recently as on 3 May, the President of the Council issued a statement on behalf of the Council declaring that

> "Members of the Council condemn and reject any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an

internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978) as unacceptable, and declare the establishment of the so-called interim government in Namibia to be null and void" [*see S/17151*].

36. I have taken the time of the Council to review the position it has taken over some 16 years in order to ask: What now? What more can the Council say? Words, after all, must mean something, and the Council, if I may say so, has run out of words. If the Council is merely to reaffirm and reiterate and re-warn, and nothing more, then, with all the respect I have for the Council, the present debate is little more than an exercise in futility. Having stated its position of principle repeatedly, having witnessed the contemptuous and arrogant response of South Africa repeatedly, I ask: What does it take for the Council to act?

37. Developments over the last seven years have served to demonstrate beyond any equivocation that South Africa will not live up to the terms of resolution 435 (1978) unless there are more effective means of pressure. It must also be recalled that the international settlement contained in that resolution was not the product of South African good will because of friendly and gentle persuasion, but rather of a combination of strong diplomatic pressure and the relentless struggle of the brave freedom fighters of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO. Good intentions, pious hopes, even strong words of condemnation will not move South Africa. Will the Council at last send a signal that it means what it says? Will the Council at last take decisive action, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations?

38. If it does not, what does the Council expect SWAPO and the people of Namibia to do? I hope that members of the Council will not resort to the simple expedient of deploring violence, treating victim and aggressor alike, of pious references to the spirit of the Charter, which seeks a peaceful settlement of disputes. We all want peace, but it ill becomes us, sitting here in the comfort of this elegant chamber, to speak to SWAPO and the Namibian people about a peaceful settlement after all the years of suffering and hardship they have endured, after all the good will and patience they have shown, unless we can show that a peaceful solution is indeed possible and that we are prepared to take decisive action to make it possible.

39. Member States reserve to themselves the right of self-defence—an inherent right, as it is called—and, indeed, they exercise that right with or without the sanction of the Council. The struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for independence and self-determination is recognized as legitimate by the United Nations itself. Why, then, should SWAPO be denied the right to conduct its struggle by all means possible, unless the Council can show that it has the will and the means to carry out the plan for a peaceful settlement embodied in resolution 435 (1978)? The people of Namibia are denied their most fundamental right to freedom and independence; they are terrorized, brutalized and marginalized, tortured and killed. What does the Council expect them to do unless it can give them real hope? It was a United States President who said that those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable. It is precisely those who make peaceful change impossible in southern Africa who must be held responsible.

40. My delegation has approached this debate in a serious spirit, even, I may say, in a hopeful spirit that the Council will at last go beyond mere words of affirmation and condemnation. The Council, I submit, has gone as far as it can on that road. The question of Namibia, in fact, provides the Council with an opportunity to correct an injustice to the Namibian people, to contribute to lasting peace in southern Africa, and to reverse the ominous trend away from multilateralism which we are at present witnessing. The cause is just. The situation is urgent. A practical settlement plan exists. Success on the part of the Security Council will have global dimensions. My delegation prays that, by deciding now to take decisive action, the Council will embark on that road.

41. Mr. HOGUE (Australia): It is with particular pleasure that Australia welcomes a fellow Commonwealth member to the presidency. You represent, Sir, a people with whom we share a common devotion to freedom, democracy and cricket.

42. I should also like to express our appreciation of the fine job done last month by our friend and neighbour, Thailand, both by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Siddhi Savetsila, and its representative, Mr. Birabhongse Kasemsri.

43. The Autralian delegation believes that it is both timely and appropriate that the Council should meet at this time to discuss the situation in Namibia. Nineteen months have elapsed since the Security Council considered the failure to implement resolution 435 (1978) and adopted resolution 539 (1983). That fact alone would have warranted a meeting to consider further the situation in Namibia.

44. Now, South Africa's decision to install an interim government in Namibia gives the matter added urgency. This decision, which was adopted in the face of universal condemnation by the international community, represents a direct challenge to the United Nations and provides a sombre backdrop to our meetings.

45. Australia remains fully committed to the implementation of the United Nations plan, as adopted in resolution 435 (1978). We remain convinced that the plan represents the only effective means of bringing Namibia peacefully to independence. When it was adopted the plan was accepted by all parties to the dispute, including South Africa; yet it remains unimplemented. The blame for this lies squarely at the feet of the South African Government, which has repeatedly found excuses to prevaricate and to retreat from its commitments.

46. South Africa's record to date has not been such as to inspire confidence in its bona fides. On the one hand, it has signalled willingness to negotiate; on the other, it has pursued policies of regional destabilization, which have caused considerable suffering and hardship to the popula-

tions of the front-line States. It moved close to acceptance of the final arrangements for the putting into place of the plan, only then to link Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. It gave the impression of flexibility in agreeing to participate in the Lusaka negotiations in 1984, yet once again stymied progress because of linkage. It entered into an agreement with Angola for the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola, but now, as outlined by the representative of South Africa in his statement on 10 June [*2583rd meeting*], it arrogates to itself the right to dispatch troops into neighbouring States.

47. The Australian Government's position on all this is quite clear. It rejects linkage as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and deplores South Africa's recent raid into northern Angola.

48. In 1978, following the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa established a so-called multi-party conference administration in Namibia. That body was the subject of universal condemnation internationally and of rejection by the Namibian people. Having been rebuffed once, South Africa has clearly not learned its lesson, but is now proceeding to establish another empty shell.

49. Australia's view on this is also quite clear, and was put by the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hayden, on 22 April 1985, when he categorically rejected any attempt to establish an internal administration. Mr. Hayden reiterated the Australian Government's belief that any unilateral moves to transfer power in Namibia that were not in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) would be null and void. He expressed the Government's serious concern at the South African Government's determination to proceed with the establishment of an interim government.

50. My delegation welcomed the fact that the Council, through its President, was able on 3 May 1985 [*S/17151*] to express its condemnation and rejection of unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978) and to declare that the so-called interim government in Namibia was null and void.

51. We should also like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his intercession with the South African Government in an attempt to dissuade South Africa from proceeding with any actions which could contravene resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).

52. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for his report [*S/17242*] and for his dedicated commitment to the implementation of the United Nations plan.

53. My delegation has listened with considerable interest to the statements made thus far in the debate. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we also participated in the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings held at Vienna from 3 June to 7 June. We are fully conscious of the depth of feeling within the international community over South Africa's policies. There may be differences of approach, but there is basic agreement on fundamentals.

54. The Council and the international community at large are agreed on their commitment to Security Council resolution 435 (1978); they condemn unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978); and they urge South Africa to live up to its professions of adherence to the United Nations plan and to take the necessary steps for its implementation at the earliest possible time.

55. I think we would also all agree that, if South Africa continues to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the Council should meet again to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

56. Given all the things which unite the whole international community, we must ensure that the South African Government is given no reason to mistake differences of emphasis for disagreements about South Africa's policies and actions. We must all send a clear, strong, unified and unambiguous message to the South African Government that the international community demands the early independence of Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978).

57. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Allow me first, Sir, to welcome you to the presidency. The Council has in you an experienced leader and a highly qualified diplomat.

58. I should also like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for their able guidance of the Council's work last month.

59. The resumed discussion in the Council of the question of the speedy elimination of colonialism and racism in Namibia is taking place at a time when the United Nations is commemorating events of great moment: the fortieth anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism at the end of the Second World War—to the attainment of which the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution—the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Day of Liberation of Africa.

60. Almost two decades ago the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*] and called for the unconditional granting of independence to the people of that country. However, the problem of Namibia is still before the United Nations as the most acute problem in the elimination of colonialism in Africa.

61. It is no mere chance that the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to resume its consideration of the question of Namibia and to give effect to its own resolutions in this regard, in particular its resolution 435 (1978). The same request was made by the Group of African States.

62. High-ranking representatives of many non-aligned countries have come to participate in the work of the Council. Speaking in the Council, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and ministers for foreign affairs of African States have very graphically spoken of the resolve of the people of Namibia and other peoples of Africa to attain complete liberation and genuine independence for Namibia. There can be no doubt that that goal will be attained, whatever obstacles are placed in the way by the colonialists of Pretoria and those that support them.

63. Almost seven years have passed since the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), setting forth a plan for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence.

64. The report submitted to the Security Council by the Secretary-General quite rightly states that South Africa's position continues to make it impossible to start implementing the United Nations plan [*S/17242, para. 45*]. Furthermore, as a result of the recent decision by South Africa to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia, the existing difficulties have been compounded further and acquired a new character.

65. It would be naive to assume that South Africa has been able alone to sabotage, for many decades now, the process of decolonization in Namibia and to resist the will and the demands of the entire international community and conduct itself so aggressively, cynically and defiantly against the African countries, the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. Pretoria could not continue that policy a single day if it did not rely on support from its Western protectors, primarily the United States.

66. The recent bandit-like raid by the South Africans against Angola in the Cabinda region again very graphically highlighted the aggressive, adventuristic nature of the actions of the Pretoria régime against its African neighbours.

67. It is precisely the United States—and South Africa along with it—that in violation of the clear decisions of the Council continues to persist in establishing linkage between Namibia independence and the question of the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalists from Angola. Almost all speakers in the Council have indicated the complete inconsistency, untenability and falsity of this linkage.

68. But, as is clear from the statement by the Secretary of State of the United States of 16 April of this year, the United States Administration continues to predicate the granting of independence to Namibia on the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola. That is, it is still blocking implementation of United Nations decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia. This obstructionist position of the United States was reaffirmed yesterday in the statement of the United States representative in the Council.

69. This notorious linkage is simply a plot by the Pretoria racists and the United States aimed at not merely creating additional obstructions to implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia but also dealing a blow to Angola to hamper its sovereign rights, including the right to self-defence embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. The ultimate goal of this sinister plot by the colonialists and racists and of this unsavoury policy is to eliminate the independence of Angola and, together with South Africa, to impose neo-colonialist decisions on Namibia and the whole of southern Africa.

70. In an attempt to concoct from puppet parties a so-called interim government, Pretoria is trying to sabotage United Nations decisions and to hold up for decades the granting of independence to Namibia to prevent the transition of power in that country to SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

71. Those are the real facts of the policies of South Africa and the United States in Namibia and in southern Africa. The hypocritical assurances of Washington regarding its so-called disagreement with Pretoria's plans to create an interim government is quite simply a smoke-screen. In fact the United States and its Western allies continue to hamper the adoption by the Council of comprehensive, binding sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and continue to expand their ties with the racist régime of that country in very different spheres—political, economic, financial and military. Of particular danger is the extension of assistance to the South African racists by certain NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] countries and Israel in creating and developing South Africa's nuclear capability.

72. The international community is quite rightly calling on the Western countries to halt their policy of placating the racist South African régime. It is the duty of the United Nations to bend every effort to put an end to the latest manoeuvres by the United States and racist South Africa to further hamper Namibia's attainment of genuine independence. The entire process of the Namibian settlement should be under the permanent and effective control of the Council.

73. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of Namibia is one of principle, and is consistent. We have stated it many times. The Soviet Union decisively condemns the racist Pretoria régime's new actions to sabotage the Namibian settlement and its measures to implant a puppet régime in Namibia to subvert the basis for a political settlement established in the appropriate United Nations decisions, primarily those of the Security Council.

74. The message from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the peoples, parliaments and Governments of all countries on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War states: "Together with all peoples, the Soviet people decisively calls for the granting of independence to Namibia and the elimination of racism from South Africa."

75. The Soviet Union expresses solidarity with the decisions adopted on the question of Namibia at the Extraodi-

nary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in April. It also supports the decisions taken at the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia held at Vienna in June and at the extraordinary session of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, held at Tunis in May.

76. Our delegation fully shares the view of previous speakers and African and other non-aligned countries concerning the actions of the racist Pretoria régime against Namibia and southern Africa as a whole in imposing colonial slavery by means of ongoing massive repression against the long-suffering Namibian people. South Africa's constant acts of aggression against independent African States create a serious threat to international peace and security.

77. We wish to emphasize however the allegation that the problem of Namibia is only an example of East-West confrontation and is simply a propaganda ploy designed to cover up a fact clear to everyone: that this is an acute conflict between colonialism and the national liberation movement of southern Africa, between the sinister alliance of the Pretoria racists, the United States and other Western countries on the one hand and the people of Namibia and independent countries of Africa on the other.

78. We fully support the appeal of the non-aligned countries that the Council adopt immediate effective measures against the racist régime of South Africa as provided under the Charter, including the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII, to ensure that Pretoria implements the Council's resolutions regarding the immediate granting of genuine independence to Namibia.

79. The Soviet Union supports the early attainment by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence on the basis of maintaining the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of South African troops and administration and the transfer of all powers to the people of Namibia as represented by SWAPO, recognized as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

80. The Soviet Union decisively condemns the continuing plundering of the natural resources of Namibia by the transnational corporations of Western States and views that illegal exploitation of Namibia's resources as a gross violation of the Charter and the decisions of the relevant United Nations bodies.

81. We support the proposals of the African countries that the Security Council should adopt further sanctions against South Africa, including an embargo on the delivery of petroleum and petroleum products to the racist régime of South Africa. Complying with the recommendations of the General Assembly and the decisions of the Security Council, the Soviet Union has no relations with the racist régime of South Africa, nor does it have any contractual agreements with it. Soviet organizations and authorities comply strictly with the resolutions of the Security Council in the matter of the arms embargo against South Africa.

82. My country has given and will continue to give every support to the just struggle the people of Namibia, under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, is waging by every means at its disposal for its liberation.

83. We also feel solidarity with the front-line States that are opposing the neo-colonialist designs of the racists and imperialists. We support the appeal that the international community give support and assistance to the front-line States in their defence of their sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of the constant acts of aggression, oppression and threat on the part of South Africa, whereby it is trying to intimidate the peoples of those countries and force them to cease assisting the national liberation movement in southern Africa.

84. To quote a recent statement by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev:

> "The Soviet Union has always supported the struggle of peoples for liberation from colonial oppression. Today once again our sympathies are with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that are seeking to strengthen their independence and social regeneration. They are our friends and partners in the struggle for stable peace and for just relations among peoples."

85. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): It is indeed a tribute to the Council and a recognition of the importance of the question before us that you yourself, Sir, have chosen to preside over our deliberations on Namibia. We are confident that this will ensure the successful outcome of the debate.

86. I would avail myself of this opportunity also to express our admiration for the extremely efficient and skilful way in which last month the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand handled the Council's affairs.

87. We have listened with great attention to the present debate on Namibia. We fully understand and share the deep frustrations which have permeated the interventions.

88. Few issues have been on the agenda of the United Nations as long as the question of Namibia. In 1969 the Security Council recognized that the General Assembly had terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory until its independence [*resolution 264 (1969)*]. Considerable efforts have since been made to secure the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

89. The adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978) added new impetus to the endeavours to reach an internationally acceptable solution. The Secretary-General, whose

tireless efforts we have always held in high esteem, the front-line States and the contact group of the Western five made invaluable contributions during the subsequent negotiations.

90. At an early stage SWAPO—whose President we are glad to see in our midst—committed itself to Namibian independence through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). South Africa's acceptance came late but eventually emerged. Yet South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant defiance of the resolutions of the Council.

91. The process of consultations and negotiations aimed at Namibia's independence in an internationally acceptable way has been long and arduous. Repeatedly the international community has been led to believe that the objective was just around the corner. However, time and again optimism quickly faded and gave way to renewed scepticism.

92. A close look at the record leaves little doubt that, each and every time, the responsibility could be placed with South Africa. Whenever momentum seemed to be gaining, South Africa raised new issues and objections. Thus, South Africa has consistently frustrated the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). the word "deception" comes all too easily to mind in this connection.

93. In his report of 29 August 1983 [*S/15943*] to the Council, the Secretary-General concluded that all outstanding issues were virtually resolved and that we had never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978). However, the report also confirmed unequivocally that South Africa had once more raised new obstacles, this time linking final acceptance of the implementation of the United Nations plan to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

94. In December 1983 South Africa undertook to begin disengagement of its forces in Angola on 31 January 1984. The completion of the withdrawal was not announced until April this year, but at least the announcement raised hopes that South Africa had finally decided to stop its military destabilization of Angola. Once more the optimism proved unfounded.

95. A month later South African soldiers were apprehended in the northern part of Angola. A prisoner—captain in South Africa's Special Forces—at a press conference held at Luanda on 28 May openly admitted that he had participated in a commando raid directed against American oil installations in Cabinda.

96. The South African Government made no attempt to excuse this renewed, blatant and arrogant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity, an operation which by no stretch of the imagination could be viewed in the context of bona fide efforts towards Namibian independence. On top of that, a few days later the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa suddenly expressed doubt about the possibility of reaching agreement in the negotiations on the question of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

97. Finally, while being engaged in negotiations aimed at creating conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the South African Government recently consented to further steps to prepare an internal settlement in the Territory.

98. Thus the international community has once more been witnessing what appears to be a consistent pattern of action by the South African Government which cannot but raise the most serious and rapidly increasing doubt about its real intentions.

99. Actually it became clear from the statement made by the South African representative in this debate [*2583rd meeting*] that, while professing adherence to resolution 435 (1978), and allegedly out of concern for the Namibian people, South Africa continues to prepare for what it believes could be another form of internationally acceptable settlement in case Cuban troop withdrawal is not forthcoming.

100. Over the years Denmark has unequivocally expressed the conviction that the people of Namibia must, without delay, be given the opportunity to decide upon their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). Denmark has offered to participate in UNTAG and supports the efforts to prepare Namibians for independence by contributing to, among others, the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

101. We have maintained that the settlement of extraneous issues cannot be a precondition for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and Denmark will never accept attempts to circumvent the plan by any kind of internal settlement in Namibia. The statement by the President on behalf of the Council on 3 May this year [*S/17151*] bears witness to the fact that this position is shared by all Council members, without exception.

102. Not least in the light of recent developments it is in our view of paramount importance that the Council once more reaffirms its direct responsibility for Namibia and its obligation to secure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

103. We should also like the Council to warn the South African Government against harbouring any illusions as to the possibility of finding any other solution to the Namibian question which will command international support than the one contained in resolution 435 (1978). The Council must condemn and reject an interim administration in Namibia and declare its establishment to be null and void.

104. Furthermore, the Council should send a clear and unanimous signal to South Africa that it intends to consider adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations if South Africa continues to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

105. To avoid any misinterpretation on the part of South Africa as to the resolve of the international community to see this longstanding issue brought to its fruitful conclusion it is important that the Council act in unanimity. This takes not only flexibility but also courage and foresight on the part of its members. The credibility and prestige of the Council are at stake; what is more, the patience of the Namibian people as well as the world community as a whole is running out.

106. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Canada, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

107. Mr. LEWIS (Canada): Mr. President, let me begin as all others have begun by acknowledging the adroit and skilful way in which you handled the affairs of the Security Council and acknowledge as well as all others have done the similar role of your predecessor last month.

108. I should like to thank you and the Council for the opportunity to participate in your deliberations today. As a member of the contact group, Canada has been intimately involved in the plans for Namibia's independence. We therefore wish profoundly that the United Nations efforts to end the conflict and to replace the illegal régime should soon succeed. On that central point, there is no room for doubt: our commitment to achieving independence for Namibia under United Nations auspices is sacrosanct.

109. Recent events in Namibia and Angola, however, give cause for disillusion verging on despair. We have been discussing the same plan for Namibian independence for the better part of a decade. That is frustrating for all of us—for all members of the Council—but any level of frustration which we may endure is as nothing when compared to the plight of the Namibian people and the continued denial of justice which they experience. Such denial is all the more reprehensible when it defies both international law and the international community. Yet, as if such contemptuous intransigence were not enough, we are now informed that there is to be another interim government in Namibia. Other than wilful provocation, what purpose does that serve?

110. Canada, as others, has already stated its rejection of the so-called interim government which is, we understand, to be inaugurated in the coming days. On 19 April last, Mr. Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, made our position clear:

> "We regard unilateral measures taken by the South African Government in relation to the establishment of constitutional bodies and the transfer of power in Namibia to be null and void. Arrangements that may be established as a result of such measures cannot have any status whatsoever under the United Nations settlement plan."

111. As the Secretary-General notes in his report, Canada strongly supported the position he took on this matter [*S/17242, para. 37*]. the evasive and dissembling response given by the Government of South Africa was entirely inconsistent with the proposal which the five Western Governments submitted to the Council on 10 April 1978 [*S/12636*]. So, seven years later, we are faced yet again with measures which are unacceptable to the international community, which challenge the United Nations plan, and which cannot conceivably succeed.

112. But that is only the half of it. While those steps are being taken in Namibia, we receive word that South Africa is withdrawing its forces from Angola, a step which we and this Council have long called for, a step we would warmly welcome, as we would welcome a total South African disengagement from Angola. However, the appearance was masked in duplicity. We now have sad and vivid evidence that South Africa still seeks what it will never achieve, namely, the reshaping of the region unilaterally, through the use of force and without regard for the sovereignty and independence of neighbouring States.

113. South Africa pleads as an excuse the need for security. How can anyone give credence to that? The world knows that the challenge to the South African State does not stem from the situation outside its borders. The seeds of change are sown within.

114. These are all depressing developments because they offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is close to accepting its neighbours as they are and living in peace with them. Worse, the developments offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is ready to co-operate with us in bringing Namibia to independence through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

115. We are virtually back to square one. That is where we started this debate seven years ago. This continuing impasse for almost a decade is a great tragedy. A peaceful and internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia would be a huge step for Namibians. It would, on the other hand, have no catastrophic effects on South Africa—quite the contrary. South African lives would no longer be lost for no good reason in Namibia and Angola, and the squandered expenses of that protracted and illegitimate conflict would be saved. The sun would still rise and fall on the Orange River. There might even be a smattering of peace in the region.

116. In the circumstances it is difficult to see why there has been so much hesitation and delay. Even now, were South Africa to comply, the decision would be welcomed throughout the world.

117. The Secretary-General in his report [*S/17242*]—and particularly in paragraph 31—recounts steps that other Governments have taken to meet South Africa's professed concerns. Yet South Africa continues to lay down a condition—the condition of so-called linkage—which has no warrant in international law, which is incompatible with resolution 435 (1978) and which has been rejected by the Council. Perhaps worst of all, that condition, by any objective analysis, is totally unnecessary, is a deliberate obstacle and is the cause of grievous delay.

118. We know from the Secretary-General's report that talks have been held and assurances given which go beyond

anything required by international law. To hold Namibia hostage to what this Council has previously described as "irrelevant and extraneous issues" is palpably outrageous.

119. On 26 October 1983, the representative of Canada was equally unequivocal. He said before the Council:

> "The Secretary-General has noted that South Africa continues to make the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola a condition for its withdrawal from Namibia. South Africa cannot . . . legitimize its illegal occupation of Namibia by raising other issues. . . . Namibia should have its independence regardless of what happens or what does not happen in Angola." [*2488th meeting, para. 83.*]

As they say, *plus ça change* . . .

120. One must not forget the negotiations on Namibia itself. It is worthy recalling just how broad and complete are the agreements which have been reached on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

121. In 1982, after intensive consultations among the parties, involving both the front-line States and the contact group, the participants were able to report to the Secretary-General that agreement had been reached on virtually all of the outstanding issues which had apparently stood in the way of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The parties accepted a set of principles concerning the constituent assembly and the constitution for an independent Namibia. And all will recall that understandings were reached on the question of impartiality and on the size, composition and deployment of UNTAG.

122. The Secretary-General himself then resolved certain points still outstanding during his visit to the region in 1983. South Africa gave assurances that the choice of electoral system, whether proportional representation or constituency-based, would be made and communicated at an early stage.

123. So what remains? South Africa's concerns regarding the transition process having been accommodated, we should now, in theory, look to resolution 435 (1978) not as an obstacle to be overcome but as an opportunity to be seized. In theory, South Africa, SWAPO and the internal parties, as well as the contact group and the front-line States, should now be joining hands to bring Namibia to independence through the United Nations plan. But the theory, alas, is shredded by the practice. All the requisite understandings are in place, but nothing happens. When is resolution 435 (1978) to be applied?

124. Some have implied that part of the responsibility for the current impasse lies at the feet of the contact group. That suggestion is unwarranted. The members of the Council know full well that Canada's reason—and all reasons, I am sure—for belonging to the contact group has been to facilitate Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations plan. That is the way it began; that is the basis on which some excellent work was done.

125. That does not mean, however, that we are blind to the delays of the past two years; we are not. The contact group, with the best will in the world, has not succeeded, any more than have others, in bringing independence to Namibia. It is necessary to admit that openly and with candour. Nonetheless, the contact group should not disband, because it still has a role to play one day under resolution 435 (1978).

126. Having said that, Canada admits that it is very difficult to know how to proceed. We shall have to look to other steps that Member States might take, steps which demonstrate that patience is long gone and that the time to move strongly is now.

127. We should perhaps consider reaffirming and reendorsing the voluntary measures as set out in Council resolution 283 (1970). Member States may wish to examine what they have done to conform with its provisions. The provisions were strong. Such measures merit further response as we await the setting of a date for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

128. We will, of course, want to confirm again our readiness to lend assistance, both human and financial, to an independent Namibia. Perhaps the Council will want to address that point.

129. Above all, we should encourage yet again the vigorous participation of the Secretary-General in seeking cooperation from South Africa to establish a timetable for independence. As the representative of Denmark just said, the future of Namibia is a fundamental issue for the United Nations. Its right to independence derives from the very principles on which the United Nations was founded. The Secretary-General has shown himself to be—on this as on all matters—indefatigable. Let the Council renew the mandate previously entrusted to him, with the added sense that he pursue the attainment of resolution 435 (1978) in an unrelenting fashion. And let us call upon South Africa, with quintessential clarity, to live up to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

130. Those are just some of the considerations which make this debate so important. Our options are narrowing. I have already indicated, as has everyone else, that there is no basis for delay and that further delay serves no one's interest. Yet unconscionable delay is precisely what we are faced with, and that is why Canada and others will have to consider our range of choices carefully.

131. On several occasions in this debate speakers have referred to the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. That leads me to one final observation. I think everyone agrees that nothing would so serve the reputation of the United Nations as a significant breakthrough on some significant aspect of peace and security. It could, with dramatic impact, turn public perceptions around. The independence of Namibia is the logical focus. It is the issue on which there is virtual international unanimity. Just as the system of *apartheid* has only one defender, so freedom for Namibia has only one obstacle. The prevarications of the

last seven years, the contempt for United Nations resolutions, the perpetual state of strife, the introduction of yet another illegal interim government, the recent revelations in Angola and, above all, the prolonged suffering and oppression of the Namibian people, must surely win from the Council a resolution on which we can all agree and which will lead to that elusive breakthrough. The timing could not be better. There is a rising crescendo of impatience with South Africa throughout the world, mirrored in the statements at the Council, signalled—as in Canada and other countries—by reviews of Government policy and reflected most recently by the votes in the Congress of the United States.

132. The Council is thus presented with an opportunity to demonstrate that the nations of the world stand united in condemning the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and stand united in urging South Africa to proceed immediately with implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We hope that the resolution which the Council adopts will reinforce such a consensus. It will then represent the most unmistakable, uncompromising and unambiguous message delivered to date.

133. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

134. M. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express to you, and through you to the other members of the Council, our thanks for giving my delegation this opportunity to speak on what is considered to be one of the most important world issues—the heinous racist régime which, in co-operation with a handful of Western States, first and foremost the United States of America, attempts to hamper the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

135. I take this opportunity to convey to you the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. I am fully confident that your political skill and diplomatic know-how will guide the Council, under your leadership, to the desired results.

136. On this occasion I cannot but express to your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, our admiration for the ideal and calm way in which they conducted the business of the Security Council during the very busy month of May.

137. The Council is now meeting, following urgent requests in letters from the President of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Chairman of the Group of African States to consider the situation in Namibia and the implementation of its resolutions in this context, particularly resolution 435 (1978). That, indeed, was the subject of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, with a view to undertaking an evaluation of the situation in Namibia and other elevant issues and to consider ways and means for the non-aligned countries to continue to intensify their solidarity with the heroic struggle for independence of the people of Namibia and assistance to that people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative.

138. Resolution 435 (1978)—which was adopted by the Council unanimously and which is considered an expression of the will of the international community on the need to put an end to the *apartheid* régime and to achieve genuine independence for Namibia—contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. This plan has encountered many setbacks. Many obstacles have been placed in the way of its implementation and indications are that the heinous *apartheid* régime is totally unwilling to heed the decisions of the international community on the independence of Namibia.

139. That régime would not have been able to defy the will of the international community, embodied in Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, without the comprehensive assistance provided by its Western allies, in particular the United States of America. It continues to reinforce its heinous policy of *apartheid* and its illegal control over Namibia, thus defying the resolutions of the international Organization. The policy of repression, oppression and terrorism is characteristic of this régime, and the killing of innocent women and children has become a daily practice. The violation of human rights in Namibia has become its first priority. There is no reason for hope; rather, the racist régime and the white minority are persisting in their intransigence, thus flouting the resolutions and decisions of the international community and thwarting the aspirations of the peoples of the world to see an end to the policy of hegemony practised by the régime in South Africa.

140. There is every indication that the white minority régime has no intention of implementing the United Nations plan. This can be clearly seen in the latest manoeuvres of the leaders of that régime to achieve a sham independence for Namibia by installing a puppet régime through the establishment of a so-called internal administration to which powers are to be transferred. Indeed, this would be tantamount to installing a puppet government to serve the interests of South Africa.

141. We also strongly condemn the fragmentation of the national unity of the Namibian people, undertaken by the racist régime through drafting Namibians in its armed forces. We further condemn its use of mercenary bands to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory. The massing of military forces and the acts of aggression perpetrated by the South African régime against the neighbouring African States pose a serious threat to the security of these independent States, as well as peace in the entire area.

142. The policy of exploitation and plunder of Namibia's natural resources as practised by the Pretoria régime, in co-operation with its Western allies, with the United States at the forefront and their transnational corporations, is a violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

143. However the régime in South Africa and its armed forces escalate their acts of oppression and terrorism against the people of Namibia, Pretoria will never be able to subjugate the daily resistance of the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative, in its valiant struggle against the racist minority régime. The day is not far off when Namibia will be fully independent and the Namibian people master of their own soil.

144. There are indications that the time has not yet come for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Tremendous obstacles preventing implementation are being erected by the régime of South Africa, in co-operation with the United States. South Africa and the United States link the independence of Namibia to purely extraneous issues. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola has no relationship whatsoever to the independence of Namibia. That presence was requested by the legitimate authorities in Angola, on the basis of full agreement between two independent States. Such linkage has been categorically rejected. It may result in delaying the independence of Namibia and ultimately undermine the achievement of independence, thus maintaining the Territory under the hegemony of the white minority régime. Its natural resources would remain under colonial pillage and exploitation, in contravention of the United Nations plan. Such linkage is a flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of an independent country-member of this Organization.

145. The further report of the Secretary-General of 6 June is perfectly clear, particularly in its concluding remarks [*S/17242, paras. 45-48*]. In those paragraphs the Secretary-General notes that it has not proved possible to finalize arrangements for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, owing to the obstacles and preconditions imposed by the racist régime in South Africa. I take this opportunity to convey to the Secretary-General my delegation's appreciation for his efforts to bring about the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, in particular Council resolution 435 (1978).

146. South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, its large-scale militarization of that Territory, and its use of Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression and sabotage against neighbouring independent States—all pose a major threat to peace and security. My delegation, therefore, believes that in keeping with the legal responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia until that Territory achieves independence, the Council must take urgent steps to assure genuine, unconditional respect on the part of the racist régime for Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978), in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative. Those steps must include the imposition of sanctions, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Until that is done, it would be useful for the Council to reiterate its resolutions 418 (1977), 421 (1977) and 558 (1984) with regard to strict respect for the binding arms embargo imposed on South Africa and to a strict prohibition on weapons imports from South Africa.

147. In our view, South Africa's stubbornness and its continuing failure to implement United Nations resolutions, in particular Council resolution 435 (1978), can have no explanation other than the encouragement of the United States. The policy of so-called constructive engagement with South Africa pursued by the United States Administration is aimed basically at encouraging the racist régime to continue rejecting the resolutions of the international community and at stiffening the determination of that régime to persist in its aggressive policies and its threats against neighbouring independent States. Providing the régime with various types of weapons and co-operating with it in all fields, including the nuclear field—which is precisely what the United States Administration is doing—are intended to bring about the failure of the United Nations plan.

148. The increased co-operation between certain Western States, including the United States, and the racist régime of Pretoria does indeed hamper Namibia's attainment of independence. South Africa can be made to toe the line only by putting an end to all types of co-operation with that régime. Continued co-operation with the South African régime runs counter to the will of the international community and to United Nations resolutions. We have only to note which States are co-operating with the South African régime to see clearly which States encourage the continued occupation of Namibia.

149. In its report,[2] the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Administering Authority of the Territory, shows clearly that it is the United States, other Western States and Israel that engage in co-operation with the Pretoria régime. This report shows that South Africa has provided Israel with uranium and has collaborated with Israel in extraction and refinement of that element, and states that Israel may be acting as the agent of the United States in weapons sales to South Africa. The United States has indeed granted permission to the Israeli Government to export military equipment to South Africa.

150. The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirms its support for the Final Document [*S/17184, annex*] adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, particularly its paragraphs 36 and 37. In this connection, we wish to reiterate our firm denunciation of the continuing co-operation by some Western States and Israel with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear, military, economic and political fields. We are convinced that such co-operation undermines international solidarity against the *apartheid* régime and helps perpetuate the illegitimate, illegal occupation of Namibia by that régime.

151. The Syrian Arab Republic also condemns the increasing co-operation between the two racist régimes, in Tel Aviv and Pretoria. In that context, we note the similarity between the aggressive designs of the two régimes, including their iron-fist policies and their employment of hot pursuit, against the peoples of South Africa, Namibia, Palestine, southern Lebanon, and all the Arab territories occupied by Israel. Moreover, we condemn the decision of the two régimes to continue and increase their co-operation in the military, economic political and nuclear fields, for such

co-operation poses a threat to international peace and security.

152. The Syrian Arab Republic calls on the United States Administration and on the States members of the European Community to reconsider the trade concessions granted through free-trade agreements with Israel and to consider their abrogation. Those concessions and agreements help in selling South African products in United States and European Community markets.

153. In conclusion, the Syrian Arab Republic declares its total solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people against the white minority régime and for freedom, independence and the full exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination. We stress our full support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We support the legitimacy of its struggle by all available means, including armed struggle, against South Africa's occupation of Namibia. We stress our complete solidarity with the front-line States in responding to the acts of aggression of the racist régime. We call on the Council to shoulder its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to take the measures necessary to force South Africa to bend to the will of the international community, including the imposition of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

154. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

155. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, I should like first to express to you and to the other members of the Council my gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the discussion of this question. I should also like to congratulate you most cordially upon your election as President for the current month. In view of your widely acknowledged abilities as a prominent and distinguished statesman and diplomat, we are convinced that the Council will successfully carry out its high responsibilities.

156. I also take this opportunity, Sir, to express my gratitude to your predecessor, Mr. Kasemsri, the representative of Thailand, for his competent guidance of the Council during the month of May.

157. The People's Republic of Bulgaria welcomes the convening of the Council to consider the situation in Namibia, at the request of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of African States. Bulgaria fully shares the serious concern of the international community over the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and the extension of the inhumane *apartheid* system to it. The Territory, where considerable military power is concentrated, is ever more frequently used as a military base and a springboard for launching so-called reprisal actions against neighbouring independent African States, actions which have gravely destabilized the situation in the region. South Africa continues to occupy part of Angola. All in all, an explosive situation has been created which is fraught with grave danger for peace and security in Africa and in the whole world.

158. There is no doubt that the question of Namibia, which has been on the agenda of the United Nations for 40 years, is one of the most flagrant examples of brutal colonial domination and predatory exploitation of human and natural resources belonging to another people.

159. The concern of the Member States stems primarily from the fact that—despite the existing universal consensus on the principles and means of solving the Namibian problem, formulated, above all, in Council resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as well as in other important United Nations documents—the successful and just settlement of this urgent problem continues to be blocked by the South African régime.

160. In this connection, we fully share the general recognition that South Africa would not have ignored so cynically these decisions had it not relied on the political, military, economic and financial support of certain Western States, particular the United States and Israel. That support is of crucial importance for strengthening the strategic potential and the military capability of the racist régime.

161. In a news report of 6 June this year, *The New York Times* informed us that nearly 300 United States companies operated in South Africa and that American investments in that country had reached $15 billion, while those firms controlled almost 50 per cent of South African petrochemicals, 70 per cent of computer production and 30 per cent of the auto industry.

162. The South African racists and the transnational corporations continue to exploit extensively the natural resources of Namibia, thus making enormous profits. There is no doubt about the shared interest of Pretoria and other outside circles in the suppression of the national liberation movement, in the colonial plunder of the peoples in that part of the world and in the consolidation of their common imperialist positions.

163. It is this shared interest that is at the foundation of the policy of constructive engagement towards South Africa, which in practice is tantamount to propping up the aggressive régime. It is also at the heart of the concurrence of the schemes of the South African racists with the strategic plans of the imperialist forces in southern Africa. Thus, the machinations of the racists and their mentors, which are aimed in practice at blocking and foiling the United Nations plan for Namibia, contained in the resolutions I have already mentioned, come as no surprise. This also explains why, in order to prevent the realization of the plan, artificial conditions totally extraneous to the Namibian issue, such as its linkage with the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, are being raised. This approach can only be described as blatant interference in the internal affairs of independent Angola and as a cover-up for the continued occupation of Namibia. It is no accident that the international community has flatly rejected such obviously obstructionist tactics.

164. The latest such manoeuvre of the South African racists—the establishment of a puppet administration in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia—has generated a tidal wave of indignation and protest. We have joined the

vast majority of Member States which have categorically condemned this new attempt of the colonial Power to prevent the just settlement of the Namibian question and to perpetuate its rule in Namibia. On the occasion of that attempt, the Bulgarian Telegraph Agency issued on 15 May 1985 a declaration which stated, *inter alia*:

> "The people's Republic of Bulgaria, which has rendered its whole-hearted support to the struggle of the Namibian people for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, and which has recognized SWAPO as their sole, legitimate representative, reaffirms hereby that the United Nations decisions, and in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), are the only acceptable basis upon which the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved immediately and without any preconditions."

165. In this connection, I should like to stress once again that whatever decisions South Africa may make in this respect are completely devoid of any legal force. The organs created by South Africa, under whatever pompous names, cannot be viewed as other than instruments of the policy of occupation and national domination. For this reason, they have been denounced and rejected by the international community.

166. Expressions of selfish interests and strategic designs are the attempts by well known forces to keep the United Nations out of the settlement of the Namibian problem. They have tried through unilateral actions to impose a neo-colonial solution on the peoples of the region that would ensure the economic, political and military advantages of certain imperialist States. It is abundantly clear, however, that the key to a just and lasting solution of the problem is not in the hands of mediators and envoys. It lies in the support the Member States give to the world Organization in the discharge of the responsible mission entrusted to it under a large number of resolutions and decisions adopted since 1966.

167. The policy of South Africa in Namibia is brazenly defiant of the international community. That policy is fraught with the danger of grave crises and an open military conflict that could spill over the confines of that part of the world. To the Member States it is perfectly clear that, as in the past, South Africa will continue arrogantly to disregard the explicit will of the international community. Hence my country supports the conclusions of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, and those of the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held at Vienna from 3 to 7 June, and calls upon the Council to impose the comprehensive mandatory sanctions envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of ensuring the immediate and unconditional implementation of the resolutions calling for the granting of real independence to Namibia.

168. The fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the formation of SWAPO are not only a serious occasion for a thoughtful analysis of the achievements made so far in strengthening world peace and decolonization; they also provide momentum to mobilize the efforts of the international community for the final elimination of the last vestiges of the shameful system of national domination. On the occasion of the anniversary of the heroic organization of the Namibian people, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate most cordially the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and once again assure him of the sincere commitment of the Bulgarian people, which itself endured centuries under the foreign yoke.

169. The unreserved support of Bulgaria for the cause of peoples fighting for social and national liberation was eloquently reaffirmed by Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, during the recent visit of the head of State of the Republic of the Congo to my country. He emphasized *inter alia* that socialist Bulgaria had invariably sided with the legitimate and just struggle of the people of Namibia, with the South African people in their struggle against racial discrimination and *apartheid*, and with the front-line States fighting to defend their independence. Bulgaria will continue to abide by this principled position in the future as well.

170. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2585th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

171. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. The manner in which you have been guiding these deliberation, the friendship that exists between the Arab nation and your country and the presence of many people whose original homeland is in the Arab world allows me to express and articulate the feelings of friendship and congratulations in a very sincere and genuine manner.

172. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the former President. During his presidency we had many moments of anxious co-operation, and we should like to express our gratitude for the wisdom with which he guided the Council's efforts.

173. At the outset I should like to read out a statement by the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Mr. Chedli Klibi:

> "On the occasion of the Security Council meetings relating to the situation in Namibia, the League of Arab States salutes the Namibian people and reaffirms the solidarity of the Arab nation with the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, for its freedom, dignity and independence.

"The League of Arab States seizes this opportunity to reaffirm on behalf of the Arab States its insistence on the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in order to ensure the realization of the rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, independence and freedom.

"The League of Arab States condemns all attempts and manoeuvres which endeavour to defy the will of the international community and the credibility of the United Nations resolutions through the imposition of the so-called internal settlement in Namibia with a view to enhancing the colonialist ambitions of the racist settlers of the Pretoria régime.

"In the meantime, the League of Arab States further condemns all attempts at introducing extraneous elements such as the linkage of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with the achievement of the independence of Namibia, which is a clear issue of decolonization entrusted to the United Nations and therefore should not be juggled in the context of super-Power considerations.

"The Council of the League of Arab States reiterated at its last session, held at Tunis from 25 to 28 March 1985, the total support of the Arab States for the struggle of the Namibian people for independence and the solidarity of the Arab nation with the heightened struggle of the oppressed majority in South Africa against the racist *apartheid* policies."

174. I wish to make a few remarks because I think that in the past few days the Council has heard to what extent South Africa is in contempt of the United Nations and particularly of the resolutions of the Security Council. We have seen how it has manoeuvred and made many attempts to circumvent the will of the international community and deny the rights of the Namibian people. This has been a pattern that, unfortunately, cannot be restrained except by the imposition of credible sanctions as prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

175. The League of Arab States and the Arab people in general have a claim to participate in the deliberations concerning Namibia because in one form or another what is taking place in South Africa pertaining to the rights of the Namibian people and self-determination is not only similar but in many ways identical to the defiance that is taking place in the Middle East on the part of Israel and the denial to the Palestinians of their right to self-determination and the withdrawal of the occupation forces from the various occupied Arab lands. The pattern is the same. The language utilized by the representatives of Pretoria and of Israel is almost identical; the excuses, the pretexts that are adduced are identical. So in many ways, when we listen here to the statements by the various States, it is as if the Council Chamber were reverberating with the echoes of what has been said in many instances in the debates pertaining to the Middle East.

176. It is no wonder that the *apartheid* régime of South Africa has close co-ordinating functional arrangements with the Government of Israel in various acts of defiance, as if those two colonial racist régime sought to reinforce each other in contempt of the decolonizing process that has encompassed the third world but has been arrested, unfortunately, in both South Africa and Namibia, and particularly also in regard to the Palestinian question.

177. For that reason, our participation is not only a question of solidarity with the people of Namibia and the leadership of SWAPO, whose struggle we salute. Not only do we condemn the racist practices but we feel that the United Nations should sustain its commitments, attempt to bring its resolutions to fruition and prove that it means what it says by the introduction of sanctions. It is high time the international community ceased to be openly defied by those two racist régimes, which act as if they were trying to set the clock back.

178. We in the League of Arab States understand in depth what the people of Namibia are going through, because we are experiencing similar oppression, violation of human rights, disenfranchisement, dispossession, forceful eviction and terrorism practised under the pretext of "law and order". The attempts to impose a so-called internal settlement are similar to Israel's attempts to impose village leagues in the West Bank and Gaza, or to what the so-called Lahd group has been doing in southern Lebanon. All these are attempts to deny the legitimacy of the international commitment and the various United Nations resolutions. It is because this pattern of behaviour has to be arrested that the Council, on the question of Namibia and on the question of the Middle East, must not be satisfied with resolutions. These are welcome but they should be made implementable. The organic relationships in the field of nuclear weapons, in the field of research and in the field of geopolitical access between South Africa and Israel warrant not only closer Arab-African co-ordination and co-operation but a United Nations investigation into the pattern of behaviour that has been introduced by those two remaining racist and colonial régimes.

179. Therefore we take this opportunity to express again our appreciation to the people of Namibia and to reiterate our solidarity with them in their struggle to achieve self-determination and in their commitment to rendering the United Nations credible and effective.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II.

[2] A/40/24 and Corr.1 and 3.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—June 1994—1,925